

Vol. XXXIV.

JANUARY, 1957.

No. 1

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

46711

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *From Jan., 1957, £1 per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. R. Donohoe, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn — Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithdown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—V. Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents :

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

- 1
- Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.
- Appointment of Bishop Lyons as Coadjutor to the Bishop of Sale—
Circular of S.C. of the Sacraments concerning the celebration of
marriages by proxy.

DECORATING CHURCH AND CHAPELS: THE PRIEST WITH THE ARTIST Rev. John P. Kenny, S.J.

8

JURIDICAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARISH PRIESTS AND CLERICAL RELIGIOUS, II,

18

Rev. Thomas Connolly, D.C.L.

MARY, THE UNIVERSAL DISPENSER OF GRACES, III,

29

Rev. Augustine Regan, C.S.S.R., S.T.D.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.

42

Eucharistic Fast and onerous work of the sacred ministry—Matri-
monial Dispensation and danger to morality—Approval of forbidden
marriage—Co-operation in unlawful operations.

CANON LAW Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L.

51

Jurisdiction for hearing confessions of seriously ill female religious—
Marriage case concerning disparity of cult.

LITURGY Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.

58

Priest and People at Mass.

HOMILETICS Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.

70

Charity, The Sum of the Law.

NOTES

74

Annual Subscription—In Memoriam: Jules Lebreton, S.J. (Rev.
William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)—Delegations to Communist China
(Rev. Patrick M. Farrell, O.P.).

BOOK REVIEWS

84

Medical Ethics (Healy); The Necessity of confession for the Sacra-
ment of Penance (McKeever); The Priest in the World (Sellmair);
First Australian Congress of Religious Brothers—Holy Bible, Vol. 3
(Catholic Biblical Association); Irish Pilgrimage (Mould); Origen
(Daniélou); Our Time is Now (O'Leary); Saints and Their
Attributes (Roeder); The Superior's Handbook (Colin); Manual
for Interior Souls (Grou) [p. 83].

SHORT NOTICES 17, 28, 50

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die Januarii, 1957.

Official Documents

APPOINTMENT OF BISHOP LYONS AS COADJUTOR TO THE BISHOP OF SALE PIUS BISHOP. SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD

to our venerable brother Patrick Francis Lyons heretofore titular Bishop of Cabasa and Auxiliary to the Archbishop of Sydney, now elected, with the right of future succession, to be Coadjutor to the Bishop of Sale—health and apostolic blessing.

Whereas the good estate and happy advancement of the people of God depend almost entirely on the assiduous diligence of Bishops, We, therefore, since We hold, by the will of the Almighty, the reins of government for the whole Church, consult her interests with all possible solicitude and make her needs the burden of Our care. Consequently, when Our venerable brother Richard Ryan Bishop of Sale, on account of failing health, asked an assistant from this Apostolic See, We gladly approved the decision taken by the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, which Sacred Congregation, using the powers that We have given it, heard the views of Our venerable brother Romolo Carboni, titular Archbishop of Sidon and Apostolic Delegate in Australia, New Zealand, and Oceania, and duly set its recommendation of Your person before Us.

Accordingly, We elect You to this office and, by Our Apostolic authority name You Coadjutor to Our aforesaid venerable brother the Bishop of Sale. By right of succession You will succeed him in the government and administration of the diocese, in all that pertains both to religious matters and temporal goods, when the same See of Sale shall, according to law, have become vacant.

Then, as is proper, You shall enjoy all the rights and privileges that belong to all Bishops and shall have the same obligations as other Prelates of equal rank.

As regards the profession of faith required by law, We exempt You from repeating it, everything to the contrary notwithstanding. The oath of fidelity, however, towards Us and this See of Peter You shall take according to the formulae We are sending herewith. This oath, subscribed with Your name and impressed with Your seal, and similarly inscribed and impressed by the Bishop who shall have witnessed Your oath, You shall send as soon as possible to the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide.

We exhort the Archbishop of Melbourne, Your former Metropolitan, to receive You with cordial and paternal kindness, and to assist You, if need be, with advice and the fruit of his experience. We likewise exhort the clergy and people of the diocese of Sale to render You due honours and to be obedient to Your bidding. By doing this they will lighten Your labours and gain heavenly rewards for themselves.

For the rest, venerable brother, We express the wish that, just as You have hitherto performed, with your adornments of virtue, episcopal duties in a manner worthy of all praise, as Auxiliary to the Archbishop of Sydney, so also in the future You will employ most assiduous diligence that the Church of Sale, which has always flourished, may advance continuously day by day.

Given from Castel Gandolfo, near Rome, on the eleventh day of the month of October, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six, the eighteenth of Our Pontificate.

Celsus Card. COSTANTINI,

Chancellor of the Holy Roman Church.

AMLETO TONDINI,

Regent of the Ap. Chancery.

BERNARD DE FELICIS, *Prot. Ap.*

CAESAR FREDERICI, *Prot. Ap.*

Despatched the 9th day of Nov. 18th of Pont.

Al. Trussardi pro-Plumbator

In Ap. Chancery Archives,

Vol. 93, No. 85.

*

*

*

*

SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The following document is a Circular addressed to the Bishops of Italy, to the Ordinaries of immigration countries, and to chaplains of emigrants. It regards particularly the celebration of marriages amongst Italian immigrants.

Through a Circular of May 1, 1932, the Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments gave to the Ordinaries of Italy some directions concerning the celebration of marriages by proxy (Canon 1089). The directions applied in particular to Italians abroad who wished to contract marriage with persons resident in Italy. The intention was to eliminate the abuses and improprieties that this form of matrimonial celebration could bring with it.

On one hand stood the practical impossibility of contracting marriage in the ordinary way of mutual presence, when the long-distance separation of the persons would involve serious inconvenience,

heavy expenses, and the danger of losing work or employment. These circumstances made recourse to marriage by proxy necessary. But, on the other hand, the adoption of this form could, for a number of reasons, give rise to disorders and abuses detrimental to the sanctity of Christian marriage.

In the case, a double need had to be regarded: the natural right of every person to establish a family, and the need of providing for the stability of such a family constituted through a proxy marriage. In the case of persons who had emigrated, the problem was of particular difficulty, especially in view of guaranteeing the family union by setting up as soon as possible the "*individua vitae communio*" which is the most efficacious bulwark of the family.

The rules and cautions, which then suggested themselves as the only ones possible, were those of a moral kind, based on the moral qualities required in the parties and especially in the party residing abroad, because, in accordance with the civil law obtaining, the passport was given by the Italian Government only on presentation of the act of summons of the parties. This supposed marriage already contracted.

The experience of more than twenty years has clearly shown what serious and numerous disadvantages have arisen. These are likely to increase in present conditions, on account of the increase of emigration, especially overseas, and sometimes on account of the unscrupulous conduct of the contracting parties.

It is necessary to observe that for some persons a marriage contracted by proxy is an easy pretext for getting abroad while eluding the emigration laws. It may also be a mere expedient for bringing a woman to a foreign country at the expense of her lawful husband, only to be destined later, after dispensation is obtained on a *matrimonium ratum et non consummatum*, to become the wife of another man. This trick of non-consummation is sometimes arranged beforehand.

It happens not infrequently that the parties are not previously known to each other or very inadequately known, sometimes only through a photograph or through summary information from persons neither disinterested nor truthful. Thus it can happen that a person from Italy, after marriage by proxy, comes for one reason or another (bad conduct on the journey, motives of difference of character, physical appearance otherwise imagined) into a situation of great disappointment. Hence repugnances from the beginning, which may soon develop into aversion and lead to an irreparable break.

Considering also that marriage by proxy is generally contracted

before the conditions required by government for emigration are certified, it may happen that the party in Italy cannot go to join his or her partner.

The most typical case is that of a woman, already married by proxy, who, just before emigration, is certified by doctors as physically unfit, and is consequently prevented from going.

But other motives, not excluding political ones, can determine the refusal of a permit to embark.

Hence, when one cannot join the other within a short time, or the marriage, after the parties meet, is found to be badly assorted on account of insufficient mutual knowledge, a series of grave moral and material consequences can result—consequences not easily foreseeable, for instance, the constitution of unlawful unions followed by illegitimate offspring, with grave outrage to the Sacrament, or the creation of critical situations especially for the woman, who would come to find herself alone in a foreign country, without support, protection, or the possibility of work, prohibited also by the laws of the country to reside and be a burden on local beneficence. Such consequences often have a tragic ending.

For such unhappy marriages a remedy is sought (when this is possible) by recourse to a dispensation from *matrimonium ratum et non consummatum*. But, undoubtedly, too facile and frequent petitions for such a dispensation are in themselves an indication of deplorable levity in a matter so delicate, and a grave irreverence towards the great Sacrament of Matrimony, that is, towards a sacred union which, on account of its divine prerogatives of unity and indissolubility, should be surrounded by all the guarantees of protection and stability.

If only to apply a partial remedy to those lamentable abuses, a new fact seems very opportune, which has just been authoritatively brought to the knowledge of this Sacred Congregation.

In some foreign States which receive Italian emigrants, the law has made it possible not only for married women to enter, but also for the betrothed of men resident in the country, provided that the marriage is regularly celebrated within a determined period of time. In Canada the period is fixed at a month.

Amongst countries that offer this facility already Australia is also numbered. And it is to be hoped that in the future other nations will imitate this provident example.

In view of this concession, the Sacred Congregation invites the

Bishops of Italy to observe the following regulations in regard to marriages of emigrants.

1. In countries where the entrance of women betrothed to residents is allowed, and in those where it will be allowed eventually, the Ordinaries should not show themselves well disposed, generally speaking, towards the celebration of marriage by proxy. They should require that the marriage be contracted in the usual and ordinary form, that is, with the contracting parties present, and therefore in the nation where the man resides. Some exception may be allowed, for example, when the circumstances show that marriage by proxy would not lead to the abovementioned improprieties (the parties being well-known to each other, or the emigration and immigration conditions being duly satisfied).

Should the parents of the betrothed women be opposed to their departure and wish the marriage by proxy, the Parish Priests should use persuasion to dissipate their apprehensions. They should remind them that the grave improprieties already mentioned are much greater than the risks facing their daughters setting out to be married in the other country—risks which can be eliminated or limited by the precautions which the competent authorities will take during the journey and during their stay in the new country up to the celebration of the marriage.

When necessary, the Parish Priests should suggest to young men about to leave for a foreign land and having the serious intention of marrying Italian girls, once they are economically settled, to make a *regular promise of marriage* in writing before departure (Cfr. Can. 1017). By so doing, they will possess a document legally valid for the competent authority, when they wish to call their betrothed to celebrate the marriage in the place of immigration in the usual and ordinary form.

From young men who have already emigrated the Parish Priests will try to get a written declaration signed by the respective young man and subscribed either by the local Ordinary or by the Missionary of the emigrants, promising marriage to the future wife, and determined in its generalities. The same Priests will also secure another document signed by the future wife to the effect that she accepts the promise made by the man. When this is done, the Parish Priests are authorised, in their turn, to give a written declaration, to be shown to the emigration officers, that the two parties have given promise of marriage and that, consequently, they are betrothed.

In this way, even if all the disadvantages of marriage by proxy are not eliminated, they are proportionately reduced.¹

2. Marriage by proxy is always to be considered as exceptional and extraordinary. As a rule, it can be allowed only when a just cause exists, and it is ascertained that the woman so married can quickly join her husband abroad, with the cautions suggested in the Circular of May 1, 1932. Particular care must be taken to require that the "procuratorial mandate" be drawn up in the precise form laid down by Canon 1089, and, regularly before the ecclesiastical authority. Also the parties must have obtained the "Nihil obstat" of the Procurator of the Republic for the civil marriage (Art III, c.c.).

Concerning the "procuratorial mandate" this Sacred Congregation is informed that Parish Priests of some dioceses of Italy require, in addition to the canonical document, the procuratorial mandate of the civil authority. Likewise, emigrants are told on the part of the Consular Representatives of Italy in those countries that it is necessary to have the authority for proxy also from the civil government, under threat of difficulties, in case of omission. The surrender of the ecclesiastical "procure" may be demanded.

This pretentious demand must absolutely cease. Marriage celebrated by proxy according to Canon 1089 is destined under the regime of the Concordat to receive regular registration in the offices of the Italian Civil State.

3. However, even in the said cases, marriage by proxy should not be authorized, if the parties have not antecedently satisfied the conditions required for emigration by the emigration laws of the various

¹The Constitution *Exul Familia* has provided adequately for the spiritual assistance of the emigrants from the place of departure till they arrive at their destination.

Every emigrant, before leaving his native place, can apply to the Committees or Sub-Committees specially desired by the Supreme Pontiff in each diocese, and secure as a safe conduct the "Tessera Ecclesiastica," etc.

In the ports of embarkation and disembarkation the Chaplains of the *Apostolatus Maris* and, during the voyage, the ship's chaplain attend, by special mandate of the Holy See and with special faculties, to the spiritual assistance of the emigrants in the delicate period of their transfer to another country.

Finally, the Missionaries of emigrants, provided by the Supreme Pontiff with parochial powers, offer to new arrivals, in their flourishing Missions and with their organizations, a secure spiritual refuge and efficacious means for insertion, gradually and without violence, into the religious life of their new country.

Through the *Giunta Catholica Italiana* there appears each month a special "Bolletino per l'Emigrazione," which provides useful information on the problem of emigration.

For the assistance of the emigrants (besides the said G.C.I.E. with central at Via Ovidio, n. 10, Rome) the Pontificia, Opera di Assistenza (P.O.A.) and the Patronages of the A.C.L.I. also provide.

countries, in view of receiving the visa of entrance for the passport, as far as those conditions can be effective before the celebration of the marriage. This is to be noted more particularly, when there is question of sickness impeding emigration, or of suspected political unsuitability; or, in the case of a man emigrating, the non-satisfaction of the obligations of conscription.

4. Note should be taken that the United States of America do not recognize the effects of marriage by proxy, even if civilly registered in Italy. Consequently, although the Italian Government grants preference, in its annual quota of emigrants for that nation to married women joining their husbands, in order that the marriage may have the protection of the local laws, it must be celebrated in the ordinary way, that is, by presence. It is well known that a painful source of troubles opens for the Sacrament of Marriage, when the respective civil act is wanting.

Besides, the Ordinaries, before agreeing to marriages by proxy, shall ascertain through documents given by the Italian Consular authorities and amply probative that the husband is in such financial conditions as enable him to support his future wife.

The Ordinaries of Italy and, on their behalf, the Parish Priests, before authorizing a marriage by proxy, shall communicate with the Parish Priests or Missionaries of Emigrants abroad, both for the exact observance of all the canonical regulations previous to marriage (just cause, status liber of the contracting party abroad, request for the usual necessary documents from the episcopal curias); and also, more particularly, in order to be sure of the seriousness and reliability of the contracting party resident there, and in order to have all the conditions fulfilled for the immediate call of the party residing in Italy.

The Sacred Congregation confides in the particular vigilance, with which the Ordinaries of Italy, will regulate, in accordance with the cautions laid down above, the marriages of emigrants. It is confident that the Ordinaries will leave nothing undone in order that the marriages may attain that stability and firmness which is required by the very dignity of the great Sacrament.

Rome, from the Sacred Congregation of the discipline of the Sacraments, 15 May, 1956.

B. Card. ALOISI MASELLA, *Bp. of Palestrina, Prefect.*

F. BRACCI, *Secretary.*

W. LEONARD.

Decorating Church and Chapels: The Priest with the Artist

At some stage in his life, a priest may have to furnish or decorate a church or chapel. How is one to do it tastefully and liturgically? Some discussion of the questions involved may not be amiss.

Even the purist, even the priest who loves the power of simplicity and advocates plainness of interior, has to concern himself with the problem of decoration, for 'decoration' here means at least such furnishings as a church must have: candlesticks, crucifix, some images, carpets,¹ credences, sacred vessels, sanctuary lamp, tabernacle veil and so on. There are many other things about which a choice will have to be made—such as murals, mosaics, drapings, stained-glasses; the field is wide in theory, though narrowed in practice by one's bank balance.

It will not be feasible to deal with the various objects of decoration nor to descend to details. Pictures and statues are our main interest. We gather together some general ideas that may assist the heavily-burdened priest in his task of decorating.

* * * *

A priest might find it profitable to consult his architect on any project concerning the adornment of his church. The whole church, not just the shell, but all the furnishings and decorations as well, should form a satisfying aesthetic unity. It is the architect who has the master-idea and who is, presumably, competent to say what will harm this unity of design. It will, of course, be harmed if anyone, at whim, sets up pious objects wherever he likes. Violent juxtapositions are common in churches. Westminster Abbey affords the classical example: fulsome baroque or Victorian tombs clashing with the venerable Gothic structure. Closer to home one finds the fresh interior of an attractive modern church disfigured by the wrong sort of picture or statue or even candlestick. In certain new churches, one has examples of an harmonious co-operation of architect and sculptor, the architect outlining to the

¹Sometimes it is stated that green is the only colour allowed for carpets within the sanctuary. This does not seem to be accurate. A distinction needs to be drawn between the carpeting on the floor of the sanctuary and the carpets on the predella and altar-steps. Green is prescribed for the floor-carpet of the sanctuary; no special colour is set down for that on the predella and steps of the altar. Cf. Huest-Mullaney-Barry, *Matters Liturgical*, New York, n. 144, f; also: *Liturgia encyclopedie populaire des connaissances liturgiques*, Paris, 1947, 195. J. O'Connell in *Church Building and Furnishing*, London, 1955, 22, is less clear.

sculptor his desires and allowing him great freedom of creative expression.

* * * *

The priest in search of pictures and statues might find it worth his while to employ an Australian artist. When we want to build, we never dream of going to an overseas architect; we go to an Australian, most probably one in our own city. When we want to decorate our churches, it may never enter our head to commission an Australian artist. Probably we seek either commercialized art (and this I shall discuss later) or art from overseas.

I do not want to canvass the vexed question of the rival merits of European and Australian artists. But I do want to underscore the fact (for it is a fact) that we have many competent Australian artists. In employing local artists we shall probably meet with as much success as in employing Australian architects. Moreover, we shall be practising a plain economy. Will any priest want to pay the costs of packing, insurance and transport (to mention only these) for overseas works of art when he can get perfectly satisfactory ones from the home market?

Some of my readers may be thinking: "I've seen the sort of vapid and futile rubbish our Australian artists give us. I wouldn't employ them. I'm no believer in modern art."

This is not the place to make an apology for modern art.² Besides, some modern art is indefensible. But whether one likes or loathes the products of the modern artist, there is, for the discerning and unprejudiced eye, plenty of evidence of genuine competence and talent.

The shallowness of much modern paintings is simply due to lack of employment—not to lack of talent. The idle artist may paint or carve or mould merely to sell in the market of high society; or he may work to experiment, to pursue a line of technical research;³ or he may be frankly pondering to his own caprice. He is somewhat like a child with nothing to do; he gets up to tricks and mischief.

But give an artist a commission, tell him you want a painting of St. Joseph or St. Francis Xavier, to be set in such and such a position in your church; he will do it well. He becomes at once contented, both as man (he sees how to pay his bills) and as artist. Nothing is more healthy for the artist than to have to grapple with a knotty, professional problem, than to have a challenge flung to him by a judicious patron.

²Cf. T. O'Connor in *Theological Studies* XV (1954), 447-459. P. Regamey, O.P., "Modern Man and the Religious Arts," *Theology Digest*, 111 (1955), 99.

³See excellent last chapter (XII) in Eric Newton's *European Painting and Sculpture*. Pelican edition, 1950, 159-167.

One of the chief ailments of Australian art is its lack of employment. On all hands our native talent is being atrophied for want of a commission.

Perhaps the most efficacious means to advance ecclesiastical art in Australia is to commission one's fellow Australian artist. If one can turn native talent to the service of the Church, one gives the best possible fillip to art in general and to religious art in particular.

It may well be that the priest who would like to employ his compatriots hesitates to do so because he is afraid of what they will give him. Perhaps he thinks that in simply approaching them he commits himself to take any flight of fantasy they offer him.

Such is not the case. What might well happen is this: the priest might first want to discuss the matter with his architect and others knowledgeable in the field of art. He might then approach an artist and give him perfectly clear specifications as to what he wants: subject-matter, size, something about treatment, position in church and so on. He will ask the artist to submit drawings and cartoons. With these before them, priest and artist can enter into fruitful discussions—just as priests do with their architects, together poring over the plans. Of course, the priest who wants the best results is tactful not to club down every suggestion made by the man he commissions. He respects the artist's superior, specialized knowledge; he allows scope for his God-given creative talent to come into full play. The enlightened patron, far from strangling originality, adroitly directs it to his ends.

* * * *

Every priest will agree with Pope Pius XII that genuine art is one of the loftiest expressions of the human mind;⁴ for art is essentially vital and creative. It seems, then, almost a contradiction in terms to call *art* those commercialized, stereotyped pious objects that are turned out from machines by the score. While being innocent of thought, they brim over with sentimentalism, at times engendering unworthy ideas about Christian sanctity or divine love. One cannot quickly forget the phrase in a Roman document about common representations of the Sacred Heart: 'A young lady with a beard showing her heart.' One wonders if a manly young Australian could maintain any respect or devotion towards St. Aloysius (whom the Church want to be a patron of youth) if he imagines the saint to have been in reality the emasculated

⁴"...ars certe inter nobilissimas humani ingenii exercitationes numeranda est, quippe quae ad infinitam pulchritudinem divinam spectet humanis operibus exprimendam eiusque quasi imago reperiunda sit..."; Encyclical—*Musicae sacrae*, A.A.S., 48 (1956), 11.

and languid youth of commercialized art. However, stereotyped art is not worth wasting many lines on; a little reflection uncovers its glaring defects. It will be enough to remind ourselves that in 1952 the Holy Office asked Bishops strictly to ban stereotyped statues and pictures that clutter up our churches, disfigure them and make them a laughing-stock to thinking non-Catholics.⁵

* * * *

A few words on a question of pressing interest: may one display in a church statues or paintings in contemporary style?

The answer is *yes*, provided one loyally respects certain safeguards. Just as the Church, with due caution, makes use of modern music and architecture, materials and techniques, so she has a place for contemporary objects of the graphic and plastic arts so long as they do not run counter to the prescriptions of Canon Law.

In his Encyclical on the Liturgy, Pope Pius XII declares:

Modern pictures and statues, whose style is more adapted to the materials in use at the present day, are not to be condemned out of hand. On condition that these modern arts steer a middle course between an excessive realism on the one hand and an exaggerated symbolism on the other, and take into account more the needs of the Christian community than the personal taste and judgment of the artist, they should be allowed full scope if with due reverence and honour they put themselves at the service of our churches and sacred rites. Thus modern art too may lend its voice to the magnificent chorus of praise which great geniuses throughout the ages have sung to the Catholic faith.⁶

History is instructive here. It reveals how eager great Christian artists have always been to be abreast of their times, seeking to express age-old Christian truths in fresh symbols, in the current idiom. Hence Christian art is only truly in touch with its history, only truly rooted in tradition, when it is ready to be contemporary. All the celebrated traditional styles of art that the Church has fostered were, each in its own day, modern.

⁵*De arte sacra, Instructio S. Officii ad Locorum Ordinarios*, 30 June, 1952; *A.A.S.*, 44 (1952), 542-546. Also to be found in—*Documenta Pontifica ad Institutionem Liturgicam Spectantia* (1903-1953), Rome, 188-191: "...Ordinarii... severe prohibeant ne multiplices statuæ effigiesque mediocris notæ, plerumque stereotypæ, in ipsis altaribus vel ad proximos sacellorum parietes venerationi fidelium inepte inconcinne exponantur", 191/19.

⁶*Mediator Dei*, 1947, *A.A.S.*, 39. Here and elsewhere the reference is to Canon G. D. Smith's translation, published by the London CTS. The number refers to the paragraph: here, 207.

Most modern artists lean towards symbolism in art rather than realism. In Christian art, symbolism has a most honourable history. In the course of nearly 2000 years, the Church has shown an emphatic predilection for a moderate symbolism rather than realism; certainly the majority of the styles she has used has been symbolic. Art that is strictly liturgical is almost always symbolic.⁷ Byzantine art, a chief channel of Christian instruction from the sixth century mosaics in Ravenna to the 13th century ones at St. Mark's, Venice, is also symbolic.⁸ I mention these facts, because what good art we see in our churches is mostly of Renaissance inspiration—that is to say, of the representational or realistic style. Too often we assume that that is the only style of Christian art.

It is not surprising that the Church should prefer symbolic art. For the truths of our Faith are so mysterious that sheer naturalism and illustration cannot adequately express them. One cannot, for example, manifest the great dogmatic truths about the Blessed Mother of God merely by photographic portrayal of the physical features of some fair and pious-looking lady. If one is to shun shallowness in Christian art, it seems as though some symbolism is required, some formalizing or stylizing.

* * * *

Modern art is much criticized for its distortions. It is well, therefore, to pause over this matter.

One must immediately observe that there is a difference between distortion and offensive distortion. Art containing distortions does not necessarily have to be banished from the church; it is only where the

⁷One needs to distinguish: religious art (which might be Mohammedan, Jewish, Buddhist, etc.); Christian art (which can be used of objects decorating a home or law-court or church); ecclesiastical art (by this term writes Fr. J. A. Jungmann, S.J., "we mean art which not merely has Christian subject-matter... we mean art in the service of the Christian community, for the furnishing of the place of divine worship; in other words, art which is to some extent a reflection of the Liturgy and somehow itself Liturgy"; "Church Art," *Worship*, XXIX (1955), 69). By 'strictly liturgical art' I mean art used in vestments, altar, chalices, etc.

⁸I give a decidedly conservative estimate of the Byzantine period. Sir Banister Fletcher (in his *History of Architecture*, 238) says that it dates from the fourth century to the present day. Herbert Read writes that the year 330 "may be taken as a sufficiently precise date for the beginning of the Byzantine period in art. Constantinople was finally taken and sacked by the Turks in 1453. Not less than these eleven centuries will suffice for the history of Byzantine art." (*The Meaning of Art*, Pelican Book, 1954, 84/44). Likewise David Talbot Rice, in his Pelican book on Byzantine Art (pp. 78 and 87), makes the great mosaic period span 1000 years.

distortion is such as to shock or upset the people frequenting the church.

Distortion is neither native nor peculiar to contemporary art. It is found in all art. Every painter distorts when he represents the three-dimensional rose two-dimensionally. The sculptor distorts the tint of living flesh when he shows it forth in snow-white Carrara marble. Classical Greek sculpture (the least distortional of all art) distorts in the interest of its ideal: the line of brow and nose was never so straight nor the face so oval as the sculptors made them.⁹ The Gothic architect distorts in his 'fixed scorn' for equality and symmetry.¹⁰ Hans Holbein distorts when he coarsens the features of his sitter to stress character.

Distortion is everywhere in art—for it is one way, and a perfectly legitimate way, of stressing, selecting. Creative activity essentially involves stressing, selecting.

Consequently, it is not distortion as such that one needs to protest against; if that were so, all El Greco's paintings would have to be thrown out of the churches. A protest is to be lodged only against certain excesses in distortion: for example, representing sacred persons or mysteries in a fashion that jars the religious sense. Hence, an object of art that showed Our Lord in a way that seems shocking or blasphemous would have to be barred from our churches.

The judgment as to what distortions are offensive or shocking is of course relative. For example, Eric Smith's winning entry in the Blake Prize Exhibition of 1956 seemed to some profoundly moving and reverent, to others frankly blasphemous. Indeed, for the average visitor to the Exhibition it was shocking. As the average parishioner in a Sydney parish would certainly endorse that attitude, one has here a sure criterion for refusing to allow that painting a place in a *parish* church. Might one hang it in a University chapel, or in a Seminary, or in the corridors of a Religious House? Possibly. One would need to test the reactions of the people who would frequent the building concerned. It might be found that the picture would find a welcome in some such place, especially if a suitable explanation of the artists's sincere aim and method were given by a competent person.

One can easily be too sweeping and dogmatic in one's assertions. Visitors to Rome will remember Michaelangelo's *Risen Christ* in the Dominican church of *Santa Maria sopra Minerva*. In this splendid

⁹Cf. Herbert Read, *op. cit.*., 24/12.

¹⁰Cf. Ruskin's *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, chapter V.

work, Christ appears nude. No one in Rome feels anything awry in this, despite the fact that the naked figure stands right up on the Gospel side of the sanctuary. But were one to transport that statue and set it up in a parish church, one would find many devout souls gravely distressed. One would probably have to debar the statue from a parish church on the ground of its being offensive to Christian modesty and decorum.¹¹

It is hard to decide what distortion is allowable and what is not. Perhaps no absolute judgment is possible. Certainly the criterion is not to be the taste of the artist, nor even that of the priest in charge. The Holy Father indicates what he wishes it to be: to wit, the needs of the Christian community.¹² About any object of art proposed for his church, the priest might ask himself: "Would my people take scandal? Would they feel this an insult to Christ or his Mother?" If the work in question would offend, then, obviously, it may not be permitted a place in the church. It may still be a piece of genuine art; perhaps it might be hung in the home of an art-connoisseur or in a House of Studies; but not in a parish church.

* * * *

The work of art needs to be comprehensible to the faithful to whom it is addressed. For art in a church serves a widely different purpose from art in a museum or gallery, private home or doctor's waiting-room. In a church, art is never merely for delight, display or pleasure; it is to teach. The Church deliberately harnesses art to her didactic purposes; she makes use of the ministry of beauty and art in order to teach as effectively and universally as possible.

Clearly, then, works that are thoroughly unintelligible can find no place in any church. Indeed art devoid of intelligibility sins not only against the canons of sacred art, but also against those of common sense. It is well if we priests proclaim this. Let us be guided by the present Holy Father¹³ and attack the dictum common amongst modern artists: "Art for Art's sake." Art, these declare, is her own mistress; she must not be forced to stoop to anything outside herself, whether morals or religion. They vindicate for themselves an unbridled liberty of self-expression, the 'sacred right' to a bigoted subjectivism and to the rejection of all considerations foreign to the artistic impulse itself. It should be stressed, I think, that these evil tendencies are rampant in certain

¹¹*Mediator Dei*, 208.

¹²*ibid.* 207.

¹³*A.A.S.*, 48 (1956), 9-11.

quarters in Australia; hence the Holy Father's condemnation of such principles is most relevant to local conditions.

Pope Pius XII warns us that the catchword: "Art for Art's sake," which some raw contemporary artists have inherited from the early 19th century, is not only specious; it is also meaningless or else expresses rank blasphemy. Both the history and the philosophy of art thoroughly corroborate his teaching.

However, while one sets one's face inexorably against really unintelligible art, one needs to show discretion about art that is simply hard to grasp. One may have to make up one's mind about a perfectly genuine and intelligible work of art which, nevertheless, could be grasped only after reflection or explanations. I am thinking of an abstract treatment of the crucifixion by Ernest Philpot, a West Australian artist. In this painting, the link between the Cross and the Resurrection is brilliantly suggested—an idea theologically most sound, being both Pauline and Liturgical. But, as I say, the treatment is abstract. Might one hang it in a parish church? Probably not. The ordinary parishioner would not be helped by it.

"Probably not"—it is not easy to decide every case. On the one hand, we do not want just shallow religious pictures, for Christianity is not shallow; and superficial art is likely to engender false ideas. On the other hand, a work that is recondite and intricate will teach nothing.

Here we may digress a moment to the parallel problem of sermons. What about preaching on the Blessed Trinity? Any priest knows that, say, Billot's splendidly speculative treatise on the Trinity would be indigestible fare for a parish congregation. Not that Billot is unintelligible—far from it; rather he is treating profoundly perhaps the profoundest truth ever made known to man.

But because it would be folly to relay Billot to one's flock, it by no means follows that one is not to preach on the Trinity. The Word took flesh to reveal this baffling mystery to us; he laid command on his Church to proclaim it to the ends of the earth and the end of time; it is a rock-bottom truth of Christianity: in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost we were baptized; at the beginning of every prayer, at the end of every psalm we invoke them. So, too, constantly in the course of the Mass and at the conferring of every sacrament. It is a truth pre-eminently to be preached. If one always fought shy of this theme and sought to preach only 'easy' doctrines, one would fail in one's mission.

Something similar may be said about art. As priests, we shall

encourage the Christian artist to grapple with the profoundest truths of our Faith. And we shall not blame him if he gives us something hard. On the contrary, if he sincerely faces great dogmas and struggles to body them forth, we shall expect something hard. We shall look askance at anything that lacks all subtlety and depth. A Christian artist who facilely illustrates the less profound elements of Christianity is hardly worth his salt.

Let us ponder the following words spoken by Pius XII to the First International Congress of Catholic Artists (September, 1950) :—

Thanks to its subtlety and refinement, art...reaches depths in the mind and heart...which words, either spoken or written, with their insufficiently shaded analytical precision, cannot attain.¹⁴

The Christian artist can say something beyond the reach of the more precise, articulated propositions of the theologian or preacher; the artist can convey the intimate sense of Christian truths, present them with a poetic beauty and luminousness possible only to art. No one can equal the artist in giving Christians a deep feeling for the mysteries of our Faith.

With a word of explanation, a quite difficult work of art might become understood and appreciated by the faithful and might, therefore, suitably be hung in their church. I know of a parish priest who erected Stations of the Cross that were original and full of thought; from the pulpit he gave some explanations; his people grew to treasure their Stations and to be much helped by them. What cannot be taken in at first often grows to be loved as time passes. An artist once said to me: "About a work of art, ask yourself—Could I live with it?" Things superficially attractive often quickly pall and may end by becoming intolerable.

* * * *

My last observation applies not only to the painter and sculptor, but to the artist in the broadest sense.

A priest who wants a work of religious art will naturally look for an artist commonly acknowledged as qualified. However, mere competence and talent are not enough—and this the priest does not forget. He naturally seeks to employ a believer, a practising Christian, if possible an excellent Catholic. Where the priest's choice lies between two equally qualified artists, his preference will be given to the better Christian.

The reason for this does not, of course, spring from Catholic free-

¹⁴*Liturgical Arts*, Nov. 1950, 3.

masonry, but from the function of art in the Church, namely, to impart Christian truth. Only an artist who is attuned to Christian truth by having the Faith and, better still, by practising it, can do justice to the sublime mysteries he is called upon to express.

In order to stress this important point, so dear to the present Holy Father, we cannot do better than quote from his recent Encyclical on Sacred Music:

The artist who does not profess the truths of the Faith even in his soul, and whose behaviour keeps him far from God, should in no circumstances turn his hand to religious art. For he lacks that inward eye to see the exigencies of God's majesty and worship. His art may indeed prove him a talented man, gifted with a certain outward technique. But one cannot hope that what he does, without religious inspiration, will truly breathe such holiness and faith as belong to God's shrine and its sacredness. Hence his works must needs be excluded from sacred edifices by the Church—the Guardian and the Judge of our religious life.¹⁵

J. P. KENNY, S.J.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE

MARIAN BOOKS. 1. THE CROWN OF MARY, by Denis O'Shea, Canon of the Holy Sepulchre. (1954. Dublin: Gill & Son. 111 pp. 5/6 Stg.).

2. RETREAT WITH OUR LADY, by Ch. Polloi. (London: Sands & Co., 1955. 170 pp. Paper cover; no price marked).

Both of these small books will be welcomed by Catholics, for the last word has not yet been said on Devotion to Our Lady. It is like a jewel that reveals new beauties as each facet catches the light. The first of these publications carries an introduction by Fr. Peyton, C.S.C.; as one would rightly surmise it is a collection of meditations on the Mysteries of the Rosary. Its best recommendation is Fr. Peyton's own: "I am confident that this work will be of indispensable help to us in our endeavour to spread the practice of daily Family Rosary throughout the world."

The second of these books has for a sub-title, A Study in the Theological and Cardinal Virtues; and that title seems more accurate than the word, Retreat. As a matter of fact, it is a valuable source-book of Christian doctrine, and teachers should find in it fresh presentation of old lessons. There is a complete section given over to considerations of Mary's "Fiat" at the Annunciation. Those who like to return often to that Mystery for their meditation should be greatly helped by the practical, yet supernatural, development. This is a book for private study and prayer, not for continuous reading.

M. O.

¹⁵A.A.S., 48 (1956), 11.

The "interior oculus" of which the Holy Father speaks here seems to hark back to St. Thomas' illuminating doctrine of knowing "per modum naturae," by 'connaturality' or harmony. The knowledge of the faith-endowed, justified man is an illustration. In recent years, Pierre Rousselot, S.J. (in his *L'intellectualisme de s. Thomas*, Paris, 1936, 70-73) has rightly called attention to St. Thomas' fruitful ideas.

See *Le problème de l'acte de foi* by Roger Aubert, Louvain, 1950 (2nd edition), part II, chapter IV, 452-513.

Juridical Relationships Between Parish Priests and Clerical Religious, 11

THE NATURE OF THE PAROCHIAL OFFICE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO RELIGIOUS. RELATIONSHIP TO RELIGIOUS (continued).

Summary:

- Art. 3. The Activity of Religious in the Parish (Continued).
 - 3) Questing
 - 4) Schools of Clerical Religious in the Parish
 - 5) Other Activities of Religious in the Parish.
- Art. 4. The Parish Priest and Different Religious.
 - 1) Categories of Religious
 - 2) Limitations of Exemption not extended to the Parish Priest.

Questing.

The parish priest, as well as exercising the care of souls, is responsible for the material administration and development of the parish. In some cases he has certain fixed sources of income to cover these expenses, but in many cases he is entirely dependent on the voluntary offerings of the faithful as in the United States of America, England, Australia and other places, both for his own material support and the maintenance and extension of the parochial buildings and activities. Consequently the activity of religious in questing and other forms of alms seeking has to be carefully supervised by the Ordinary and the rights of the parish priest preserved in these matters. This, however, does not mean that the parish priest has an exclusive right to appeal to the generosity of his parishioners. The Holy See and the local Ordinary can and do grant permission to religious to quest in the parishes of certain dioceses and regions.

The Code directs that private individuals, both clerics and laymen, are forbidden to collect alms for any charitable or ecclesiastical institution or purpose without the written permission of the Apostolic See or their proper Ordinary and of the Ordinary of the place where the collection is to be made. The regulations of canons 621-624 regarding the collection of alms by religious are not affected by this canon.⁴⁶

Vromant defines questing as a personal and general endeavour to collect goods or money for charitable purposes.⁴⁷

In the concrete, questing can be defined as a personal and general

⁴⁶C. 1503.

⁴⁷Quaestuatío seu collectio eleemosynarum dicitur, personalis et satis generalis quaesitio largitionum. *De Bonis Temporalibus*. G. Vromant, C.I.C.M., ed. 3a. Editions de Scheut, Bruxelles, 1953, p. 89.

canvassing of a locality for the purpose of collecting alms for one's self, for other persons or for some other pious work.⁴⁸ The questing must be personal, i.e., the person seeking alms must approach the faithful directly.⁴⁹ Therefore, begging by means of circular letters, handbills, advertisements, etc., does not come under the Code definition.⁵⁰ The appeal must be general, i.e., from door to door, or at least many must be appealed to for help. To beg, for example, from a few friends or from the special benefactors of the community does not constitute questing or begging in the canonical sense. The appeal must be carried out in a locality. Therefore soliciting donations in a church or from some society or association,⁵¹ visiting of individual benefactors in the hope that they will make some donation or gift are not included in the canonical definition of questing.

Written appeals for help do not come under the term "questing." This is clear from the decree "*Singularis Quidem*" of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars stating that nothing prevents a Superioress, without asking permission of the Bishop, from accepting alms freely offered anywhere, or from asking any good and charitable persons by letter to help the houses and institutions over which she presides, as long as the legitimate superior has not from reasonable cause forbidden this method of obtaining financial aid.⁵² The collection of alms in the form of "drives" and "appeals" comes under the law of the Church. These collections are often made, not by the religious themselves, but by lay helpers and friends who call on all in their assigned districts. Canon 1503 rules that individual clerics and laymen are forbidden to collect alms for any charitable or ecclesiastical purpose without the written permission of either the Holy See or their proper Ordinary and the Ordinary of the place where the collection or appeal is to be made. Likewise the drawing up of a complete list of generous persons and benefactors, followed by a personal appeal to them, must be considered as questing in the strict sense.⁵³

The legislation of the Church on questing and alms seeking is found in the Code in Canons 621-624 for religious and Canon 1503 for private persons and in the various decrees of the Sacred Congregations.⁵⁴ As

⁴⁸De Carlos, o.c., n. 406, See. Schaefer, o.c., n. 1229. Woywood, o.c., Vol. I, p. 304. *Collecting of Alms for Religious*, O'Brien, o.c., p. 245. *De Eleemosynis Colligendis*, 21st Nov., 1908 (Men). A.A.S., 1909, I. 153. *Singularis quidem*, 27th March, 1896 (Women), A.S.S. XXVIII, 555.

⁴⁹*De Eleemosynis Colligendis*. A.A.S. 1, p. 153.

⁵⁰*Religious Men and Women*, Creusen, n. 319.

⁵¹Cfr. Vromant, l.c.

⁵²A.A.S., XXVIII, 555. Woywood, o.c., p. 305.

⁵³Schaefer, o.c., n. 1292 ad finem; Vromant, o.c., n. 80.

⁵⁴See O'Brien, o.c., p. 246, note 23.

is clear from the explanation of the canonical term "questing" great freedom is given to religious in the matter. Seeking assistance from acquaintances, asking the aid of a few persons even though not acquaintances, soliciting donations in a church, making appeals in homes to which one has been invited, requesting the assistance of single benefactors or groups of the same, making written appeals for help all such are outside the meaning of questing and alms seeking in the Code and the religious are not forbidden to make such appeals, unless the local Ordinary for some reason forbids it.

With regard to questing in the strict sense, the Ordinary can only interfere, provided that all the rules of the canons have been observed, when the questing is indiscreet and brings odium and contempt on the Church or interferes with the work of the parish priest in the place where the questing takes place.⁵⁵ In addition, as was indicated above, the religious enjoy great liberty in their appeals which do not technically come under the canonical term questing. Nevertheless, the Ordinary or other local authorities may restrict these activities. In the fifth Provincial Council of Malines, in Belgium, 1937, n. 161, the soliciting and collecting of alms by means of circular letters, post cards, advertisements in papers and periodicals is forbidden, without the requisite permission.⁵⁶

The Law on Questing.

In the matter of alms seeking, Regulars in general and all religious pertaining to Congregations are subject to the jurisdiction of local Ordinaries. Mendicants are exempt from the same and enjoy the right to beg alms in the place where they have a canonically erected religious house. Only religious who are Mendicants in the strict sense have the right to beg without permission of the Ordinary of the place.⁵⁷ These are Regulars who by their institute bear the name of Mendicants and Mendicants in fact, i.e., those whose rules and constitutions forbid not only individual property, but also the holding of property in common. Under this classification are grouped the Friars Minor, Capuchins, and Jesuits (by reason of professed houses and its residences which are compared to the professed houses).⁵⁸ Members of Congre-

⁵⁵See Vromant, o.c., 80, Schaefer, o.c., n. 1293, *De Elcemosynis Colligendis*, A.A.S. I, p. 153, n. 13.

⁵⁶Quoted Vromant, o.c., p. 90, note 3, "Pro Belgio..."

⁵⁷C. 621, par. 1.

⁵⁸Council of Trent, Sess. XXV C. 3, *de Regul. et Monial.* Pius V Const. *Cum Indefessae*, July 7, 1571. B.R. VII, 923. Wernz, Vidal, o.c., III, n. 25 foll., Creusen *Religious Men and Women*, 319 seq. O'Brien, o.c., p. 246. The latter wrongly includes disalced Carmelites.

gations approved by the Holy See must have a special privilege from the Holy See and the written permission of their Ordinary in order that they may collect alms. Only a special clause in the indult can dispense them from obtaining the Ordinary's permission. Diocesan Congregations depend solely on the different Ordinaries in this matter.⁵⁹ The Code recommends Bishops to show themselves rather indulgent to the regular Mendicants, but to fix strict limits to the permissions granted to other religious.⁶⁰

The parish priest is not included in the prescription of Canon 1503. This canon refers to private persons whether clerics or lay people. The parish priest as a public person does not require any special permission to seek alms in his parish for the church, schools, works of charity and other undertakings.⁶¹ The parish priest possesses the right to appeal for alms in his parish, but at the same time he cannot prevent the questing of Mendicants in the strict sense and those religious who have this privilege and the local Ordinary's permission. Even with regard to these he has certain rights. For example, he can demand to see the testimonial letters of the religious questing in the parish, if they do not show them of their own accord. He should rebuke any transgressions of the norms for questing as prescribed in the constitutions, "Singularis Quidem" and "De Eleemosynis Colligendis." If religious, for example, fail to travel two by two when actually questing, or if young religious are sent out on this mission, he should ask the religious superior to correct this state of affairs.⁶² If his rebuke has no effect

⁵⁹C. 622, pars. 1, 2.

⁶⁰CC. 621, 622.

⁶¹See Vromant, o.c., p. 90, *Epitome* II, 823, Prummer *Manuale Iuris Canonici*, Herder and Co. Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1927, q. 445.

⁶²CC. 623, 624.

Quoad Ordines Mendicantes.

5) Ut Mendicantes praefato iure gaudeant, per seipsos, non autem per personos Ordini extraneos, eleemosynas colligere debent.

6) Mendicantes quaestuantibus semper secum habere debent litteras authenticas quibus constet de debita facultate deque officio quaestuationis sibi commisso. Quas litteras parochis ultro exhibere tenentur; necnon Ordinariis, quoties ab ipsis requirantur.

7) Non licet Superioribus regularibus ad hoc opus mittere nisi Religiosos aetate et animo maturos: numquam eos qui studiis adjuc incumbant.

8) Religiosi eleemosynas collecturi non pergant soli sed bini, praesertim extra orbem seu locum ubi habent conventum, seclusa gravis necessitatis causa; quo in casu quaestuarium publice notus sit oportet atque aetate, virtute, ac fidelium aestimatione omnino commendatus.

9) Porro extra locum conventuum quaestuantibus, apud parochos vel apud alios clericos seculares vel regulares, aut iis deficientibus, apud aliquem pium benefactorem, christiana honestate et virtute conspicuum divertant.

10) Extra propriam domum non maneant ultra mensem, si in propria diocesi; non ultra duos, si in alia, eleemosynas quaerant...

he must refer the matter to the Ordinary.

The parish priest cannot prevent any activities among his parishioners by means of which funds are raised for religious by social, sporting and other activities, provided that the activity does not come under the term "questing," and that there is no infringement of diocesan laws and regulations.

Schools of Clerical Religious in the Parish.

In view of the fundamental importance of education and the attempts which have been made, especially in the nineteenth century, to exclude the Church from the education of youth the Holy See has clearly defined the nature and extent of her authority in this matter. The religious teaching of youth in all schools whatsoever is subject to the authority and inspection of the Church. The local Ordinaries have the right and duty to see that nothing is taught or done contrary to faith or good morals in any of the schools of their territory.⁶³ This jurisdictional power which is of divine origin, authorizes the Church to supervise religious and moral training in all public and private schools, whether these be elementary or secondary institutions, colleges or universities.⁶⁴ The local Ordinary, in his diocese, and the parish priest, in his parish under the direction of his Ordinary, are the custodians of the faith and morals of their flock.⁶⁵ At the same time, clerical religions are often engaged in the work of religious and moral training of youth in the diocese and in the parish. Their colleges, schools, orphanages, and similar institutes are all carrying out this work.

Prior to the Code, the principles governing the relationship of the Ordinary and the parish priest to educational institutions in the diocese and parish were clearly defined in the constitution, "Romanos Pontifices" of Leo XIII, 8th May, 1881.⁶⁶ The constitution sets down norms for two types of schools.

11) Qui in ipso loco ubi situs conventus stipem corrogant, noctu extra propriam domum nequaquam manebunt.

12) Religiosi quaestuant es semper illa, qua decet humilitate, modestia, munitio, eniteant; saecularium, praesertim mulierum cuiuscumque sint conditionis, familiaritatem caveant: loca suae professioni minime congrua omnino devitent...

Quoad Ordines vel Instituta non Mendicantes.

(nn. 6-13 of previous section apply to all who have received permission to quest.)

A.A.S. De Eleemosynis Colligendis, 21 Nov., 1908, 1, p. 153 and foll.

Exceptions with regard to missions of Holy Land entrusted to Franciscans. See *A.A.S.* II, 729.

⁶³C. 1381.

⁶⁴See O'Brien, o.c., p. 224 and note 12.

⁶⁵C. 336, par. 2, c. 469.

⁶⁶*Fontes* III, 582.

1) Elementary or Primary schools.

Primary and elementary education, because of the importance of grounding the young in the principles of religion, belongs to the Ordinary.⁶⁷ In the following paragraph, the Supreme Pontiff goes on to show that Bishops have at all times and in all places been most sedulous in promoting and securing the education of the young, in their elementary schools, both in urban and rural areas. At the same time the parish priests, as the helpers of the Ordinary, have been given an important part in this work of education. Parish priests have been directed to establish schools in all their parishes. They have been given the duty of teaching in the schools, especially with regard to Christian Doctrine, and of obtaining suitable and qualified assistants for this work. If parish priests failed in the discharge of these duties they must be considered as having failed in their duties as pastors.⁶⁸ Because of the diocesan character of the work of the primary and elementary schools the local Ordinaries have the right to make the canonical visitation of all such schools whether they be located in regular or secular missions and parishes.⁶⁹

2) Other Schools.

A distinction is made between these elementary parochial schools whether conducted by Regulars or not and other schools conducted by Regulars. "The case," Leo XIII declared, "is entirely different with respect to the other schools and colleges in which male religious, by the prescription of their order, occupy themselves with the education of catholic youth. For in these institutions, both right reason and we ourselves, demand that the privileges which have been granted by the Holy

⁶⁷"Nemo exhinc non intelligit istam puerorum institutionem in Episcoporum officiis esse ponendam, et scholas de quibus agitur tam in urbibus frequentissimis, quam in pagis exiguis inter opera contineri quae ad rem diocesanam maxime pertinent."

⁶⁸"Eorum nempe decretis prospectum est ut illas (scholas) Episcopi in oppidis et pagis restitui et augeri curarent...Ad haec, quum Patres Conciliorum probe intelligerent parochos etiam pastoralis ministerii compotes esse, partes haud exiguas iisdem tribuerunt in scholis puerorum, quarum cura cum animarum curatione summa necessitate iungitur. Placuit igitur in singulis paroeciis pueriles scholas constitui, quibus nomen est parochialibus impositum: iussi sunt parochi munus docendi suscipere, sibiue audiutricem operam magistrorum et magistrarum adsciscere: iisdem negotium datum scholas regendi et curandi diligentissime: quae omnia si non ex fide integreque gesserint, officium deseruisse arguuntur, dignique habentur in quos Episcopus animadvertat. In unum ergo collineant argumenta ex ratione et factis petita, ut scholae, quas pauperum vocant, institutis diocesanis et parochialibus iure adnumerandae sint..."

Ibid. par. 19.

⁶⁹Ibid., par. 19.

See retain their entire juridical force."⁷⁰ After this decree there could be no doubt about the exemption of such schools, even with regard to their religious and moral programme.⁷¹

Law of the Code.

1) Religious and moral education in primary and elementary parochial schools is subject to the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary. The parish priest enjoys parochial jurisdiction over such schools, unless they have been withdrawn from his jurisdiction, according to the laws of the diocese or province.⁷² If the elementary school is entrusted to the care of clerical religious whether exempt or non-exempt the Ordinary retains his jurisdiction over the school and, unless special arrangements have been made, it remains under the jurisdiction and special vigilance of the parish priest.

2) With regard to other schools in the parish, which are governed by clerical religious, even in the absence of an explicit exemption from the jurisdiction of the parish priest granted by the Ordinary in the case of non-exempt religious,⁷³ they must be considered as withdrawn from the jurisdiction and vigilance of the parish priest. These religious are carrying out the work of education either because it is one of the purposes of the institute or because the Ordinary has granted them a commission to carry out this work. They still remain, however, subject to the jurisdiction and vigilance of the Ordinary.⁷⁴ The parish priest has no obligation to watch over the moral and religious training of the young given in these schools. This is the duty of the religious super-

⁷⁰Alia profecto causa est ceterarum scholarum et collegiorum, in quibus religiosi viri secundum ordinis sui praescripta iuventuti catholicae instituendae operam dare solent; in hisce enim et ratio postulat, et Nos volumus firma atque integra privilegia manere quae illis ab Apostolica Sede collata sunt..."

Ibid., par. 20.

⁷¹Vermeersch *Periodica* XV, 1927, p. 57. *Exemptio Collegiorum Regularium a Visitatione Episcopi.*

⁷²*Concilium Plenarium IV Aust. et Novae velandiae Habitum apud Sydney, 1937. Editio Officialis.*

Dec. 606 Qualibet paroecia suam habeat scholarem elementarem ex redditibus ordinariis paroeciae sustentendam...

607 Quaelibet schola tradatur, et plurimum, alicui familiae religiosae...

610 Parochis vehementer praecipimus ut scholas elementares toto animi affectu prosequantur, et summa diligentia eisdem invigilent.

614 In qualibet schola elementari singulis diebus pueri pro eorum captu et aetate tradenda est institutio religiosa.

615 Parochus vel eius vicarius visitet unaquaque hebdomada singulas scholas ibique vigilet ut institutio religiosa fructuose tradatur.

617 Subjiciantur semel in anno omnes discipuli uniuscuiusque scholae periculo in materia institutionis religiosae a loci Ordinario adprobata.

See O'Brien, o.c., p. 225, II Law of the Code.

⁷³C. 464, par. s.

⁷⁴CC. 1381, pars. 2, 3. 1382.

iors and the local Ordinary, or in the case of those religious who enjoy exemption from episcopal visitation with regard to the moral and religious training given in their institutes, the Major Superiors.⁷⁵

However, as regards day pupils and those who attend such institutes only for part of the day and normally live with their families, they are not withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the parish priest, and if he realizes that the education of his parishioners is not what it should be or that some abuse as regards faith or morals has developed in the school or institute, he can, in virtue of his office, approach the superior in order that the defects may be remedied. In the event of a refusal or non compliance he must have recourse to the Ordinary who will act according to the prescriptions of law.

By reason of Canon 1382 the Ordinary cannot make a canonical visitation of internal schools for professed religious of exempt institutes. Except in the case of a special privilege, however, all internal schools of religious, even exempt, are subject to this visitation where there is question of non-professed subjects.⁷⁶ The parish priest, however, does not share the power of the Ordinary in any way with regard to these schools, v.g., Apostolic schools. Such schools are entirely withdrawn from his jurisdiction and those attending them are subject to the religious superiors.

Other Activities of Religious in the Parish.

In all the activities of the religious in the parish, with regard to social work, youth training, Catholic Action, etc., in so far as these activities affect the parishioners, the parish priest has the obligation of watching over the spiritual welfare of his flock. Although he does not possess jurisdiction over the religious and their lawful activities, he does possess a true authority over his parishioners and he can take the necessary steps to safeguard the faith and morals of his flock. As pastor he is justified in bringing any lawful complaints to the notice of the superior, and in the event of negligence or fault on the part of the religious, there is an obligation on the superior to correct the abuse. In the event of disagreement and controversy the matter must be settled by the Ordinary.

⁷⁵*Romanos Pontifices*, l.c., par. 20. The provisions of this constitution are still in force. Canon 1382, speaking of episcopal visitation, contains no revocatory clause annulling the contrary rights of particular institutes; consequently the many institutes that, through privilege, custom or prescriptive right, have enjoyed exemption and immunity from visitation in the matter under discussion, still retain that status. O'Brien, o.c., p. 225. *ibid.* note 17.

⁷⁶See Schaefer, o.c., n. 1414.

Art. IV—THE PARISH PRIEST AND VARIOUS RELIGIOUS IN THE PARISH.

In order that the various juridical relationships between the parish priest and religious in the parish may be understood, it is necessary that the various categories of religious be clearly distinguished one from another. These categories are 1) exempt religious (clerical and lay), 2) nuns (moniales), 3) clerical non-exempt religious, 4) religious of lay Congregations, male and female, (non-exempt). The purpose of this work is to consider the juridical relationships between the parish priest and clerical religious, both exempt and non-exempt in the parish.

The term exempt is here accepted according to the norm of Canon 488, n. 2, i.e., a religious institute of either solemn or simple vows, which has been withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary. This exemption from the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary necessarily includes complete exemption from the jurisdiction and power of the parish priest which is only a partial and imperfect participation in the jurisdiction of the Ordinary.⁷⁷ All exempt religious, whether belonging to an Order or a Congregation, either clerical or lay, male or female, enjoy this exemption from the jurisdiction of the parish priest, who is himself the subject of and inferior to the Ordinary.⁷⁸

At times, in the Code, the exemption of religious is limited in their relationships with the Ordinary. Canon 615 states that Regulars . . . are exempt together with their houses and churches from the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary with the exception of the cases expressed in law. The privilege of exemption is sometimes granted to other religious,⁷⁹ but they remain subject to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary in the cases stated in law. Such exempt religious, as members of a religious family, are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Ordinary and are subject to their religious superiors in all things pertaining to the religious life. They do not, however, enjoy the same degree of liberty in the exercise of the apostolate. The religious, as a parish priest, comes directly and immediately under the jurisdiction of the Ordinary.⁸⁰ Exempt religious are bound to follow the special regulations which may be issued by the local Ordinary with regard to the admission of visiting priests to the celebration of Mass.⁸¹ They are subject to the local Ordinary with regard to obtaining faculties for hearing the confessions

⁷⁷CpR. *De Potestate Parochiali in relatione ad religiosos*, Larraona, 1927, vol. 8, p. 36.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁷⁹C. 500.

⁸⁰CC. 630, 631; see cc. 295, 296.

⁸¹cc. 804, par. 3, 831.

of the faithful,⁸² with regard to divine worship,⁸³ the holding of processions,⁸⁴ assisting at the Ordinary's request in the catechetical instruction of the faithful and when there is question of teaching non exempt persons they must follow the regulations of the Ordinary in this matter.⁸⁵ When there is question of preaching to those outside the religious house⁸⁶ faculties must be obtained from the local Ordinary.⁸⁷ Exempt religious are subject to payment of the seminary tax.⁸⁸ They are also subject to the laws governing the censorship of books,⁸⁹ etc. XIX.

Despite these limitations, imposed by law on the absolute exemption of the religious with regard to the Ordinary, the exemption of such religious from the jurisdiction and power of the parish priest remains, for such limitations of exemption are never granted in favour of the parish priest.⁹⁰

The consequences of this complete exemption from parochial jurisdiction are clear. The parish priest has no power and enjoys no parochial rights over exempt religious in the parish, nor is he bound by any obligation towards them. He cannot, for example, hear the confessions of exempt religious, as their parish priest, validly everywhere⁹¹ but only according to the norm of Canon 519 or Canon 522. He has no obligation, in virtue of his office, to administer the Sacraments to such religious and they do not participate in the "missa pro populo."⁹²

The Ordinary himself may withdraw communities of religious from the jurisdiction of the parish priest. This power is granted to the Ordinary by reason of Canon 464, par. 2. If the Ordinary grants this exemption from parochial jurisdiction to a religious community all obligations and rights of the parish priest cease with regard to these religious.

Having indicated these general principles, the particular juridical relationships between parish priests and clerical religious in their parishes must be considered. The parish priest exercises the care of

⁸²C. 874.

⁸³CC. 1261, 1274, 1279, 1291.

⁸⁴C. 1293.

⁸⁵C. 1334, 1336.

⁸⁶C. 514, par. 1.

⁸⁷CC. 1338, 1337, 1339; see 1343, 1345.

⁸⁸C. 1356.

⁸⁹C. 1385. See O'Brien, o.c., *The Limitations of Exemption*, Chapters XVIII,

⁹⁰See Larraona, *CpR*. II, 1921, p. 280-281, CC. 528, 529, 875 par. 2, 1338 par. 3.

⁹¹C. 881, par. 2.

⁹²*Parochus ex officio tenetur curam animarum exercere...*C. 464, par. 1. See C. 892 and C. 466.

souls in a determined territory. In that territory, he is to exercise the care of souls for the benefit of all who are not withdrawn from his care.⁹³ At the same time it is possible for communities of clerical religious to live in the parish and to exercise the sacred ministry there. In order to explain the juridical relationships between the parish priest and clerical religious in the parish, it will be necessary to consider 1) the rights and obligations of the parish priest towards the religious, 2) the rights and obligations of the religious towards the parish priest, and 3) the special prerogatives of the parish priest, and the rights and privileges which the parish priest and clerical religious share in common, particularly with regard to the care of souls and the apostolate. Before considering these relationships in detail, however, the rights of the parish priest with regard to the erection of a house of clerical religious will be defined.

(To be continued)

T. J. CONNOLLY.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE

HEART AFIRE: Devotion to the Sacred Heart, by M. D. Forrest, M.S.C. (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds. 1953. 95 pp. 4/6 stg.).

Priests of at least three Orders have been interested in the production of this little book. It first appeared in single chapters in "Emmanuel," a magazine published by the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament for priests; and the preface to this book, in which those chapters are gathered, was written by Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., of Fordham University; while the author himself is a well-known member of the Australian Province of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart.

Within a small compass, Fr. Forrest has given us a comprehensive and thorough study of Devotion to the Sacred Heart. There are satisfying quotations from the Scriptures, the Fathers of the Church, and the Statements of Popes Pius IX, Leo XIII and Pius XI. Also included is a detailed account of Our Lord's Revelations to St. Margaret Mary. There are two inspiring chapters on Reparation and Consecration without which devotion to the Sacred Heart becomes a mere matter of formal word-spinning. It is good to see set down on a page St. Margaret Mary's formula of consecration, which will recall many to an earlier fervour.

M. O.

⁹³C. 464, par. 1. The term, "clerical religious," is defined in Chapter V, Article 1.

Mary, the Universal Dispenser of Graces, 111

Summary:

IV. *From Implicit to Explicit.*

Sub-Apostolic teaching that Mary is the New Eve. Mary, the spiritual Mother of men. Co-Redemptress. Her earthly and heavenly mediation. Office of Universal Dispenser of Graces part of her association with Christ in the entire work of Redemption.

V. *Significance and Dogmatic Value of Doctrine.*

Its meaning. Its definability. Its actual status in the Church—1) the ordinary magisterium, 2) theologians, 3) Liturgy, 4) persuasion of the faithful.

Conclusio.

Doctrine is undeniable and even seems proximate to faith.

(1) *Mary, the New Eve:*

That Mary plays in the restoration of the human race a place parallel to that held by Eve in its ruin has been the explicit teaching of the Church from at least the second century, when it was proclaimed by St. Justin Martyr, St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, the last of whom died before the middle of the third century.⁹⁹ Thus along with the new Adam, Who according to the express teaching of St. Paul is Christ, the Redeemer, Mary has her part in the triumph over evil, intimately united to her Son, though subject to Him. This has recently been confirmed by Pius XII in the Bull "Munificentissimus"¹⁰⁰ and the Encyclical "Ad

We note only: (1) that the antiquity of this doctrine, so widespread in the second century,¹⁰² makes it very likely that it was explicitly taught by the Apostles, and this likelihood is the stronger in view of the fact that St. Irenaeus through St. Polycarp descends in direct

⁹⁹Justin, Dial. Tryph. PG. 6. 100: Irn Adv. Haer. PG. 7, 1958; Tert, De Carne Christi, PL. 2, 827-828. See Newman's powerful answer to Pusey's "Eirenicon", "Difficulties of Anglicans" (1876), p. 31-43, where these and later Fathers are cited.

¹⁰⁰"Maxime autem illud memorandum est inde a saeculo 11, Mariam Virginem a Sanctis Patribus, veluti novam Evam proponi nove Adae, etsi subiectam artis-sime coniunctam in certamine illo adversus inferorum hostem, quod...ad plenissimam deventurum erat victoriam de peccato et morte, quae semper in gentium Apostoli scriptis inter se copulantur". (AAS, 1950, p. 768). For St. Paul's teaching on Christ the new Adam see Rom. 5-6: 1 Cor. 15, 21-6. Coeli Reginam".¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹"nova veluti Heva cum novo Adam consociata fuit" (AAS, 1954, p. 635). Congar (art. cit), while admitting that the Fathers regarded Mary as the new Eve, does not allow that for them this explicitly signifies that Mary is related to Christ in the work of reparation as Eve to Adam in the work of destruction. He does not deny that it could be implied objectively.

¹⁰²"Tertullian represents Africa and Rome; S. Justin represents Palestrine; and St. Irenaeus Asia Minor and Gaul" (Newman, p. 33).

spiritual lineage from St. John, the Evangelist:¹⁰³ (2) Mary is opposed to Eve precisely because her obedience and fidelity are opposed to the latter's disobedience and incredulity. This means she is thought of not as a mere material vehicle of the Incarnation and Redemption, but as a free and intelligent co-operator in the mystery itself, such indeed as the Gospel narrative of the Annunciation has already shown her to be. In short, the parallel adds no new idea to what the New Testament tells us of Mary's place in the world's Redemption, but it makes her association with Christ the Redeemer in His Work clearer and more explicit. She is His Mother and His consort.¹⁰⁴

(II) *Mary, Mother of men:*

The idea that Mary is the spiritual mother of men is found explicitly in St. Irenaeus and Origin, both belonging to the second century, the former speaking of the opening of "that pure womb which regenerates men unto God"¹⁰⁵ and the latter saying explicitly that of everyone who has the life of Christ within him Christ Himself says to Mary: "Behold thy Son, Christ".¹⁰⁶ Later testimonies are innumerable.¹⁰⁷ and the doctrine of Mary's spiritual maternity is taught over and over again by the Roman Pontiffs. In fact it is so inculcated by the Church's ordinary magisterium that it seems at least proximate to faith.¹⁰⁸

What concerns us here is that it is part or only a different aspect of the truth that Mary freely consented to the Redemptive Incarnation. Her charity towards us in voluntarily bearing the Redeemer Who gives us life makes her our true spiritual mother.¹⁰⁹ Whether she became so at the Incarnation itself, on Calvary, or at Pentecost, the important thing is that her office is bound up with Redemption or is part and parcel of the part she herself has played and plays in the dramatic combat waged by her Son with Satan on behalf of our souls. We must remember, as a consequence, that Mary is not only the

¹⁰³*ibid.*

¹⁰⁴This is beautifully expressed by Scheeben's idea of Mary as the Bride-Mother of the Word. ("Dogmatik", B. 3, n. 1587-1590), cf. Feckes, "The Mystery of the Divine Motherhood" (1939): Staffner, S.J., in "Clergy Monthly", Aug., 1955 (n. 241-252).

¹⁰⁵Adv. Haer. 4, 33, 11, PG 7, 1080.

¹⁰⁶In Ev. Jo. Praef 6, PG 14, 32. Congar does not accept this text or the one just quoted from Irenaeus as implying Mary's spiritual maternity in the mind of their authors. (See n. 77 above).

¹⁰⁷See W. R. O'Connor: "The Spiritual Maternity of Our Lady in Tradition", Marian Studies, vol. 3 (1952), p. 142-173.

¹⁰⁸Roschini, "Compendium," p. 274, cfr. Shea, "Marian Studies," 1 cit. "The Teaching of the Magisterium on Mary's Spiritual Maternity", p. 35-110.

¹⁰⁹cf. S. Augustine (see above note 77).

Mother of individual members of the faithful, but is Mother of the entire Church as that mystical and social entity which is the continuation of Christ Himself, which He loved and for which He delivered Himself up that it might be without spot or wrinkle, holy and without blemish.¹¹⁰

(III) *Co-Redemptress*:

Guided by the magisterium theologians no longer hesitate to apply to Mary the title "Co-Redemptress."¹¹¹ What does the title imply? The term Redemption applies not only to the work of the Redeemer in amassing for us graces by His Death on Calvary, but also to the continuous application of those graces to our souls. Mary is along with and subject to Her Son the Co-Redemptress because of her association with Him in this latter phase, for, as the theme of this paper maintains, through her hands all graces pass. Is she the Co-Redemptress also in the sense that she co-operated in Her Son's redemptive work here on earth? Such co-operation might be either remote and mediate or proximate and immediate. All agree that Mary co-operated mediately by her consent to the Redemptive Incarnation, but can we go further and say she was immediately associated in the very work of Redemption, offering to God with Jesus the very price of our salvation, Her Son's Passion, and meriting along with Him, though in complete dependence on Him, the inexhaustible supply of graces to be applied to souls throughout the ages? Here theologians differ,¹¹² but according to Revelation itself it is completely necessary to ascribe an immediate role in the acquiring of graces to the Mother of God so that she is Co-Redemptress in the fullest and strictest possible sense of the term. Only then is her heavenly role as the dispenser of all graces seen in its proper perspective and placed on absolutely solid foundations.¹¹³

¹¹⁰Eph. 5, 27, Pius XII speaks of Mary's maternal care for the Mystical Body "e scisso Corde Servatoris nostri natum" ("Mys. Corporis", AAS (1943), p. 248).

¹¹¹Thus S. Pius X calls her "Reparatrix perdidit orbis"; Benedict XV says we may assert "ipsam cum Christe humanum genus redemisso", Pius XI "Redemptionis" opus cum J. C. participavit".

¹¹²Chief protagonist of the negative view is Fr. Lennerz, S.J., in various articles and books reviews in "Gregorianum", vg. 1938, p. 419-444; 1947, 574-597; 1948, 118-141; 1952, 304-321, whose views are shared by Canon Smith in his excellent work: "Mary's Part in Our Redemption", just republished (1954), ch. IX, Fr. W. Keane, S.J., ACR, 1945, p. 134-146, and others. Fr. Dillenschneider, C.S.S.R., is probably the outstanding defender of the view we follow, having written on it no less than three books besides many articles.

¹¹³Thus also M-J. Nicholas, O.P.: "La Co-redemption" (Rev. Thomiste, 1947, 37-41). Dillenschneider: "Pour une Coredemption mariale bien comprise" (1949), p. 9-12; Straeter, S.J., "Gregorianum", 1944, p. 24-28).

The Popes themselves use expressions presupposing Mary's co-redemptive activity was taking place at the very time her Son was dying on Calvary. Thus Benedict XV represents her to us as suffering and almost dying with her Son on Calvary and thus redeeming with Him the human race;¹¹⁴ Pius XII, in words reminiscent of those of Benedict, tells us that as the New Eve most intimately united to her Son she offered Him on Golgotha to the Eternal Father—"pro omnibus Adae filiis, miserando eius lapsu foedatis".¹¹⁵ "Ad Coeli Reginam" gives the latest and clearest Papal teaching on Mary's role in the work of Redemption. Expounding the foundations of Mary's Queenship the Pope says that one of them is the outstanding part which, by the Will of God, she took in the work of Redemption ("ex Dei voluntate in aeternae salutis nostrae opere eximias habuit partes"). Whence he argues: if Mary was associated with Christ, the principle of salvation, as Eve was associated with Adam, the principle of death, in such a way that as the human race was done to death by a virgin, so is it saved by a virgin; if moreover she is always and most intimately joined with Christ and has offered Him to the Eternal Father on Golgotha for all the children of Adam, then she is queen, not only because of her Divine Maternity, but also because of her association in the work of Redemption, just as Christ is king, not only as Son of God, but also as our Redeemer. The force of the contrast between Mary and Eve, as well as the *a pari* argument from the Kingship of Christ to the Queenship of Mary seem to require us to understand this association of Mary with her Son as extending to objective Redemption itself.¹¹⁶

The Doctrine is implicitly contained in the Gospel account of the Annunciation, according to which Mary freely consented to become the mother of one she knew would be the world's Redeemer. Therefore, she then willed and intended to offer her Son on Calvary so that under Christ her act and her merits were an immediate source of the acquiring of graces for all men. Therefore Mary's presence on Calvary, where she offers her Son, is no new act but rather the consummation and ful-

¹¹⁴AAS. 1918, p. 182.

¹¹⁵AAS, 1943, p. 247, cfr. S. B. Carol, O.F.M., "Mary's Co-Redemption in the Teaching of Pius XII", AM.Ecc.Rev., Nov., 1949, p. 353-361. The same author's exhaustive study, "De Coredemptione B. Virginis" (1950) should also be consulted.

¹¹⁶cfr. Roschini, Marianum, 1954, p. 427, who comments: "It was not possible to express in a more vigorous synthesis the immediate co-operation of Mary in the Redemption": also W. G. Most *ibid.*, 1955, p. 354-368, who argues that the Encyclical definitely excludes Lennerz's interpretation of previous Papal statements.

filament of what she intended at the Annunciation, and as time goes on, sound theology, the devotion of the faithful and the magisterium itself have become more conscious of this and see more clearly Mary participating in the very sacrifice of Calvary.¹¹⁷

It is beyond our scope to summarise the vast literature dealing with this matter, or the controversy it has provoked. What interests us is that the latter has served and serves a most useful purpose in bringing out the nature of the association of Mary with Christ. A serious, but not by any means unanswerable, difficulty to the position we have adopted, is that in the very terms of the definition of the Immaculate Conception Mary is herself redeemed, and since Redemption is one work she cannot redeem others. She must first be redeemed herself. Hence her active redemption of others presupposes Redemption already accomplished—a clear contradiction.¹¹⁸

In three brilliant and profound studies of the whole question¹¹⁹ Fr. M. J. Nicholas, O.P., makes the point that Mary's Immaculate Conception and the special kind of redemption it implies, she being preserved and not cleansed from sin, fit her to be with Christ the Co-redemptress of all others. The one Redemption is applied analogically to Mary and others so that she who is separated from others in the manner of her redemption can be, under Christ, the principle or rather co-principle of acquiring it for others. There are not, then, two redemptions but one, and in this one redemption Mary being first, by a logical priority, redeemed herself, redeems the world along with the primary Redeemer.

We thus place Mary at the very heart of the Mystery of Redemption wrought on Calvary, and have a clearer view of her association with Christ decreed from all eternity. Thus, too, do the various prerogatives

¹¹⁷cfr. Journet, "L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné," vol. 2, p. 412-18. One of the most intriguing aspects of the whole question is the nature of Mary's merit in acquiring graces for us, a point much discussed at the Marian Congress in Rome in 1950. (cfr. *Acta Congressus*, vol. 1, p. 243-255).

¹¹⁸The difficulty is not nearly as formidable as those who urge it would have us believe and certainly has not shaken the allegiance of the vast majority of contemporary Mariologists to Mary's Co-redemption in the strict sense. Thus Fr. Carol ("De Coredemptione", p. 49) claims it has two hundred supporters in the twentieth century alone, citing over fifty of them with references.

¹¹⁹Rev. Thom, 1946, p. 182-187; 1947, p. 20-44; 1954, p. 469-482; cfr. Dillenschneider, 1 cit., p. 101-110, and the profound article of M. Bélanger, O.M.I., *Rev. de O'Univ. de Ottawa*, 1954, p. 133-176.

That there is a connection between Mary's Immaculate Conception and her office as Co-Redemptress seems confirmed by the encyclicals, "Mystici Corporis" and "Ad Coeli Reginam", in both of which Mary is portrayed as offering her Son on Calvary for men, being herself completely free from all sin whether personal or original (A.A.S., 1943, p. 247; 1954, p. 635).

of Mary interlock so as to throw light not only on each other but also on the entire mystery of Mary herself. Mother of the Redeemer, the new Eve, Christ's Consort, Mother of men, Co-redemptress of the entire human race—all these express so many truths that are rays of one central truth concerning the humble maiden whose unspotted virginity shed over the darkness of this world the Eternal Light, Who is Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself.¹²⁰

(IV) *Two Phases of Mary's Mediation:*

Intense devotion to the Mother of God is a legacy handed down to us from early Christian centuries. We have seen how with the progress of time Christians realised more and more that they must go to her in every need, and how long before the time of St. Bernard they pieced into their prayers invocations that explicitly proclaimed her as all powerful with God and the one from whom, under God, all graces come. With St. Bernard and his times the categorical statement that God has willed us to have everything through Mary, has become an explicit part of Marian doctrine treasured by the faithful. But it is no mere isolated truth but a part rather of what revelation has always told us explicitly of the association of the Mother with the Son. What Mary did for us on earth and what she does for us now in Heaven are inseparably connected, because both on earth and in heaven she is the universal Mediatrix along with the One Mediator, Our Lord Jesus Christ.

That this is the foundation of Mary's universal intercession for us in heaven and her heavenly role in the distribution of all graces has become more and more clear with the deeper understanding and penetration of the revealed deposit, that has come with the centuries. St. Alphonsus argued that all graces come through Mary because God has associated her with her Divine Son in undoing the ruin wrought by our first parents.¹²¹ The Popes who teach us that Mary dispenses all graces tell us she does so because of her association with Jesus in the work of Redemption.¹²² The work of our restoration is not finished with the acquisition of graces on Calvary, but it continues with the application of

¹²⁰Praef. de B.V.M.

¹²¹"Glorie di Maria", p. 1, cap. 5, p. 2 (p. 206-221).

¹²²Thus S. Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XII, all of whom speak of Mary's co-redemptive work on earth and universal dispensation of graces from Heaven as complementary parts of her salvific activity. Benedict, after speaking of Mary's presence on Calvary immolating her Son, goes on: "*hac plane de causa quas e redemptionis thesauro gratias omne genus percipimus, eae ipsius perdolentis Virginis veluti e manibus ministrantur*" (AAS, 1918, p. 182). Tradition, especially as interpreted and recognised by the Bulls "Munificentissimus" and nearly a hundred years previously "Ineffabilis", has found this intimate association of Mary and Christ already indicated in the Protoevangelium (Gen. 3, 15),

them that must be made till the end of the world. Very clearly does St. Paul teach that here we have but two phases of the one process: "Christ Jesus that died... Who is at the right hand of God, Who also maketh intercession for us".¹²³ The priesthood of Calvary is everlasting for our High Priest in Heaven" is always living to make intercession for us".¹²⁴ The one Sacrifice "hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified".¹²⁵

If then Mary by consenting to the Incarnation has placed herself at the heart of the Redemptive mystery itself, there we must find her wherever that mystery is being accomplished—on Calvary, therefore, when the price of Redemption was offered by her with her Divine Son, and now in Heaven whence its fruits are being distributed in all the graces given to men. We arrive at this truth not merely as a conclusion or as the logical result of Mary's part in acquiring graces on Calvary,¹²⁶ but as part of the explicit revelation associating the Son and the Mother. We have passed not from truth to truth, but from a general and confused to a clear and distinct understanding of one and the same truth.¹²⁷ Under Christ Mary redeemed the world on Calvary and under Christ she continues to redeem men by dispensing the fruits of Redemption. Similarly our thesis shows itself as included in the concept of Mary's spiritual maternity of all men. The life she acquired on Calvary is for all: hence all who are called to it are her children, and what is her task in dispensing graces to all but the maternal task of fostering and preserving and developing life in all her children?

SIGNIFICANT AND DOGMATIC VALUE OF DOCTRINE.

(i) *Significance*:

We thus see the doctrine of Mary's universal dispensation of graces in its proper theological significance and background. Mother of the

according to which the woman in and through her seed will triumph over the devil and his seed. (cfr. Ceuppens: "Mariologica Biblica", p. 16-17 (2 ed. 1951), where in view of this tradition he abandons his former view that the text can be applied to Mary only by accommodation, admitting it refers to her "in sensu literali pleniore"), "Fulgens Corona" speaks in the same sense (AAS, 1953, p. 579). For exegetical reasons that Mary is meant literally, see B. Rigaux, O.F.M., in *Revue Biblique*, 1954, p. 345-348.

¹²³Rom. 8, 34.

¹²⁴Heb. 7, 21.

¹²⁵ib. 10, 14.

¹²⁶Druwe (1 cit., p. 538) applies to Mary what St. Thomas says to prove that Christ has the office of dispensing the fruits of Redemption: "est autem consequens ut qui aliquibus aliqua bona acquirit, eadem ipsis dispenset" (C. Theol., cap. 241). Some question the validity of the conclusion (vg. Friethoff, p. 183) not in its intrinsic truth but as following *apodictically* from Mary's part in objective Co-redemption. The point need not worry us here as our main argument is of a higher order.

¹²⁷cfr. Bainvel, "Dict. Apol. de la Foi Cath.", vol. 3, col. 290-295.

Redeemer, Co-redemptress and Mother of men, it is her office to distribute the fruits of Redemption itself. Every grace comes through her hands and this is not in contradiction of the fact that the sacraments give grace "ex opere operato". It is Mary who procures for people the opportunity to receive the sacraments and, in the case of adults, it is she who obtains for them the actual graces necessary to receive them with proper dispositions. Likewise she obtains the graces whereby sinners are justified by perfect charity or contrition and it is she who keeps up the supply of actual graces necessary for those in sanctifying grace to avoid sin, grow in merit and persevere to the end. Consequently all grace, actual and sanctifying, is due to Mary and even favours, in themselves purely temporal, that are useful for our salvation.

Let us note, too, that the arguments we have used are valid to prove that this divine arrangement whereby everything comes through Mary admits of absolutely no exception. To say that there is or could be one single grace that does not depend upon her intercession is to deny that association with her Divine Son, which Revelation teaches us extends to the entire process of redemption. There is no grace which is not the fruit of Calvary, and no grace, consequently, that is not redemptive.

(ii) *Dogmatic Value:*

(a) *Definability:*

Since the beginning of this century theologians have asked themselves whether Mary's universal mediation in the distribution of graces can be defined as a dogma of faith. This is to inquire if it is contained, implicitly at least, in the deposit of faith. Some require that such inclusion in the deposit should be formal, that is, the proposition so contained does not follow from explicit revelation by a strict process of reasoning by the aid of a premiss known from natural reason, but by means of a deeper and clearer penetration of the meaning of the explicit revelation. Others consider virtual revelation to suffice, that is, the Church can define a proposition deduced by strict reasoning from what is formally or explicitly revealed, even though that involves the introduction of notions not in the original revelation, provided we do not go outside the same ontological reality.¹²⁸

To answer the question that concerns the definability of the doctrine we are considering there is no need to take sides in this contro-

¹²⁸Cfr. the well-known controversy between Fr. R. Schultes, O.P., and Fr. Marin-Sola, O.P.

versy. We have maintained that Mary's office as the universal dispenser of graces emerges as part of the divinely revealed association of Jesus and herself in the work of Redemption. We introduce no concept not originally used to express the primitive revelation, and all theologians admit in such a case that the doctrine may be defined, because certainly covered by the Authority of God revealing.¹²⁹

(b) *Actual Status in the Church:*

Somewhat different is the question as to the actual status of the doctrine in the modern Church. Everything in the revealed deposit is definable, but every definable doctrine is not always ripe for definition or proximately definable. That depends on its relation to the clearly expressed mind of the Magisterium. Thus certain propositions are untenable as rash, erroneous or suspect of heresy according as they seem to endanger, deny by implication or even probably contradict what is proposed for the explicit belief of Catholics, and the contradictory must be held as the safe common teaching, theologically certain, or pertaining to faith.

What we must now decide is whether our present proposition has, in the actual mind of the Church, reached such a degree of certainty that one is no longer free to doubt or deny it, and if so, what precisely that degree of certainty is.

In the absence of a solemn definition we must fall back on the teaching of the ordinary magisterium, which will not only be manifested by official acts of the Pope and bishops in union with him, but by such things, too, as the teaching of theologians, the Liturgy and the "sensus fidelium".

1. *Actual Teaching of Ordinary Magisterium:*

We are bound to believe with divine faith not only what has been solemnly defined by either the Pope or Ecumenical Council, but whatever is taught as divinely revealed by the Church's ordinary and universal magisterium, which means the bishops throughout the world teaching in union with the Holy See.¹³⁰ What is taught by the universal episcopate on our present subject?

Certainly, as we have seen, the Popes themselves have proposed the doctrine with the utmost clarity, although not infallibly. Also they do not say the doctrine is divinely revealed, although it is certainly

¹²⁹Interesting matter on the definability will be found in the articles of Dr. Leonard (ACR, 1926, p. 4-19). Fr. J. Cleary, C.S.S.R. (Ir. Ecc. Rec., 1929, 1.462-290) and Fr. F. Connell, C.S.S.R. (Am.Ecc.Rev., May, 1926, p. 456-471).

¹³⁰Conc. Vat. Sess. 111, cap. 3, Denz., 1792.

taught as true. We may safely assume that what the Head of the Church has taught so clearly and for so long a time, is loyally re-echoed in what the Church's subordinate pastors teach their flocks. Emphasis on the truth of the doctrine must, in the very nature of the case, gradually lead the Magisterium to propose it as divinely revealed, for the main arguments supporting its claim to show that such precisely is the case.

That this is so, is strikingly confirmed by the well-known fact that when, some thirty years ago, Cardinal Mercier sought the views of his fellow bishops on the definability of the doctrine more than four hundred and fifty replied favourably. The three who replied in the negative did so not because they opposed the doctrine, but because they regarded its present definition as inopportune.¹³¹

2. *Teaching of Theologians:*

Dissentients amongst theologians to Our Lady's universal mediation in the distribution of grace are so few as to be negligible. Not all who teach it tell us of the certainty with which they regard it, but very many find it implicitly revealed,¹³² some adding that it is part of official Catholic doctrine¹³³ or even proximate to faith.¹³⁴ It could be that those who propose it as probable¹³⁵ understand it in the sense that every grace without exception comes through Mary and although, so far as theological arguments are concerned, this statement of it seems beyond doubt, it can be that it is not so clearly the explicit mind of the magisterium. We believe that all would regard it as at least morally certain that Mary is the normal dispenser of graces.

3. *The Liturgy:*

In the "Mediator Dei" Pius XII outlines the force of the argument from the Liturgy. "The sacred Liturgy", he says, "does not absolutely

¹³¹cfr. Bittremieux, p. 153, n. 6.

¹³²Thus Hugon, Bainvel, Druwe, Roschini, Bittremieux and practically all the authors referred to in the course of this paper. To these we can add Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. ("La Mère du Sauveur", p. 259-260), Msg. Parente ("De Verbo Incarnato", p. 305-307), etc.

¹³³vg. Aldama, S.J., in the recently (1953) published third volume of "Sacrae Theologiae Summa" (p. 447) says the thesis is "saltem doctrina catholica".

¹³⁴Roschini, p. 294.

¹³⁵Thus Daffara, O.P., after a careful presentation of the arguments says: "sic valde probabilis apparet sententia, quae docet omnes gratias singulis, hominibus non derivari a Christo nisi per Mariam" ("De Verbo Incarnato", n. 657). Diekamp-Hoffmann after, after giving it as "fidei proximum" that Mary "apud Deum intercedendo omnibus hominibus omnes gratias salutes distribuere potest", qualifies as "sententia probabilis" the almost identical proposition: "postquam beatitudinem adepti est, nullus homo ullam gratiam salutarem accipit nisi per eius specialem intercessionem" ("Theolog. Dog. Man.", vol. 3, p. 431-432).

or of itself designate or constitute the Catholic faith. The fact is that the Liturgy, besides being divine worship, is also a profession of heavenly truth subject to the Church's supreme teaching authority, and therefore it can provide important indications to decide some particular point of Catholic doctrine".¹³⁶

Mary's prominence in the Liturgy evidenced in her numerous feasts, the title she enjoys, the liturgical prayers addressed to her as the "Salve Regina", "Ave Maris Stella", can have no other import than that she is the one to whom we must go in every need, the one from whom all graces come. Of especial significance is the approbation by Benedict XV of the Mass and Office of Our Blessed Lady as the mediatrix of all graces, which expressly celebrate the truth that everything comes through Mary. As the Hymn for Matins puts it:

"Cuncta, quae nobis meruit Redemptor,
Dona partitur genitrix Maria,
Cuius ad votum sua fundit ultro
Munera Natus".

If it be true, as the Pope himself has recently confirmed,¹³⁷ that "legem credenti lex statuit supplicandi", then we are bound to profess that Mary dispenses all graces.¹³⁸

4. "*Sensus Fidelium*":

What the faithful in all parts of the world are intimately persuaded of as a religious truth must necessarily be true. Such a universal persuasion is guaranteed by the teaching of the magisterium and partakes of the infallibility enjoyed by the magisterium itself; it is the Church's infallibility "in credendo".¹³⁹ Have the faithful the intimate persuasion that all graces come to them through Mary?

There can hardly be any hesitation about the answer to the above question. Popular devotions to Mary, the coupling of her name with

¹³⁶AAS, 1947, p. 541. Trans. ACTS, p. 28.

¹³⁷ibid.

¹³⁸cfr. Bittremieux, p. 153-154, Cleary, p. 482-484. The Mass and Office of the Mediatrix of all graces has been replaced by those of Mary's queenship. This strengthens the Liturgical argument as the new feast is for the Universal Church and explicitly celebrates Mary's role in dispensing all graces as part of her queenship.

¹³⁹Franzelin, "De Div. Trad. et Script", p. 103, n. 1. His whole thesis runs: "Conscientia et professio fidei in toto fidelium coetu a Spiritu veritatis per magisterium authenticum successionis apostolicae semper conservatur ab errore immunis. Licet ergo sive singulis de plebe fidelium sive plebibus integris non sit facultas authentice docendi, totius tamen populi Christiani" catholicus sensus "et consensus in dogmate fidei censeri debet unum ex criteriis divinae Traditionis" (Thesis XII (ed. 3), p. 103).

that of Jesus, the widespread love of the Holy Rosary, the practice of invoking her aid before beginning any undertaking and in all difficulties and trials, the instinctive recourse to her in every need and for every want—what do such widespread practices indicate except the truth that Mary is all powerful with God? Can the faithful believe Mary has such power without at the same time believing that she who, as St. Teresa of the Child Jesus puts it, is more Mother than Queen, is constantly dispensing favours and that it is part of her maternal office to do so? Without doubt the intense devotion of Catholic people to the Mother of God, which has grown to its present proportions through the grace of the Holy Spirit, finds its justification only in the implicit persuasion that everything comes through her.

Of this widespread conviction that Mary is the source, under Christ, of all graces there is no more striking evidence than the extension and truly miraculous spread of devotion to the Mother of Perpetual Succour, rightly called "the World's Madonna".¹⁴⁰ As Fr. Cleary has pointed out, "there is a *very close* connection between this devotion and the doctrine of Our Lady's Universal Mediation; for the veneration of the Sorrows of Mary—which are the motives of her dispensatory privilege; the manner in which the unknown artist has associated the symbols of Christ's Passion with the Divine Maternity; and, especially, the *title* itself, Mother of *Perpetual Succour*, that is, "Mother of all Graces"; all these elements in the picture constitute effective, if silent, apostolate of Mary as the Universal Mediatrix".¹⁴¹

Passing over other indications of the worldwide character of this devotion, such as the vast membership of the Confraternities of Our Lady under this title,¹⁴² let us mention one of recent and phenomenal growth—the Perpetual Novenas to enlist her unfailing help.¹⁴³ It is estimated that in the United States alone over a million people attend these devotions weekly and that they are attended by a million and a half throughout the world¹⁴⁴—and let us remember the number grows every day.

¹⁴⁰See "The Miraculous Picture of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour", by Fr. D. Buckley, C.S.S.R., ch. 10.

¹⁴¹ *cf.*, p. 480.

¹⁴²See Fr. E. Wuenschel, C.S.S.R., "The Popular Forms of Devotion to Our Lady of Perpetual Succour" in "Pietas Alphonsiana", p. 127.

¹⁴³They are paralleled by "Suplica Perpetua", in Spain and S. America, a method of perpetual supplication to Our Lady through organised groups (*ibid.*, p. 128).

¹⁴⁴Wuenschel, p. 128, Henze in "Marianum", 1951, p. 93. Baclaran (Manila, P.I.) has 70,000 weekly.

Surely it is evident from all this that the Marian devotion and doctrine of the modern Church are tending more and more to the explicit conviction that God has indeed revealed that all graces are dispensed to us through Mary. As yet we have no infallible pronouncement of the Magisterium by way of a solemn judgment, but the belief is fostered and inculcated by the highest authority and is clearly reflected in the Liturgy and the intimate convictions of millions of the faithful. It would not be unreasonable to maintain that it is already taught as divinely revealed by the ordinary and universal magisterium, and if that is so, then it is already a matter of divine faith. What appears to us certain is that, if it is not already taught in this way, the Holy Spirit is guiding the Church very surely along the lines that will lead eventually to its explicit propositions. Certainly, too, one could not deny or doubt it without implicitly denying or doubting the guidance of the Holy Ghost in the Church or without implying the possibility that the Spirit of Truth is leading the Church into error.

It seems, then, in conclusion, that the very least we can say about the dogmatic value of our thesis is that it is theologically certain, that it cannot be denied without the note of error. Personally we would go further and call it proximate or pertaining to faith, as something already probably taught by the magisterium as of divine faith, and would regard one who denies it with pertinacity as suspect of heresy.

Providence has not seen fit to fulfil the wish expressed by the great Cardinal Mercier as far back as 1916, but his words uttered then are just as actual and must find a response in every Catholic heart: "May the Holy Spirit inspire the present Pontiff, in these sorrowful days, to proclaim dogmatically that Mother of God and our Mother is perpetually for us all, Our Lady of Succour, or, in other words, the Universal Mediatrix for humanity at the throne of her Divine Son".¹⁴⁵

A. REGAN, C.S.S.R.

(The End)

¹⁴⁵Quoted by Fr. Cleary, p. 480.

Moral Theology

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST AND ONEROUS WORK OF THE SACRED MINISTRY.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I should like to have your opinion on a phrase of the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* with regard to priests celebrating Mass *post gravem sacri ministerii laborem*. Must the labour concern the sacred ministry directly, or could it concern the duties appointed to a particular priest, such as organising, supervising studies, preparing lectures, attending the markets at an early hour to purchase the necessities for his community, etc.? Must a priest who is engaged in duties like these wait till after nine o'clock to say Mass, if he has had a cup of tea or coffee early in the morning?

PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

The works entrusted to a priest may be many and varied, excluding only those which are incompatible with his clerical state or out of harmony with it.¹ Some of his energies are devoted directly to the task of saving souls: the administration of the Sacraments and Sacramentals, preaching, catechising, spiritual help to the sick, pastoral visitation, etc. These would be 'works of the ministry' in the strict sense. In addition, he must prepare his sermons, organise sodalities, and exercise direction over all that has for its immediate purpose the promotion of religion and the spiritual good of the people. By reason of their intimate connection with his priestly responsibilities, these works are necessary for the care of souls, and may be justly considered as 'works of the ministry'. Then, there are many other activities in which a priest may engage, either from choice or at the direction of his superiors, which are only remotely connected with the exercise of his sacerdotal powers: secretarial work, administering ecclesiastical property, organising detailed ways and means to reduce the parochial debt, tending to the material wants of a religious community, a college or some charitable institution, giving instruction in secular subjects. Though the priest who is called on to perform such duties may direct them towards the ultimate good of souls, considered objectively, can then be classed as 'works of ministry'? They do not require the exercise of any power of orders or jurisdiction, and generally could be attended to by a lay person, secular or religious.

¹Can. 138, 139.

The question is whether these last activities, undertaken by a priest as part of the duties assigned to him, become 'works of the ministry' and provide a cause for a relaxation of the Eucharistic fast, in accordance with the provisions of the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus*. May the priest who is engaged in them from early morning or for a long time take some liquid refreshment and afterwards celebrate Mass? It seems reasonable to hold that a priest who complies with the directions of his ecclesiastical superiors is engaged in the works of the ministry. His activities, in the circumstances, may be said to assume a sacred character because of their purpose. Further, it will be found that the duties given to a priest are not so far removed from the sacred works of the ministry as may appear. In some cases, they belong to the sphere of ecclesiastical administration and can be considered an exercise of the priestly office and authority; in other affairs, there is question of the work of Catholic education, or promoting genuine Christian charity. Seldom, if ever, will the priest be asked to undertake any activity which is not at least very helpful for the spread of the kingdom of God. The conclusion would seem to follow that occupation with matters of duty for a long time before Mass would be a valid reason for the inconvenience required for a relaxation from the Eucharistic fast. It must be noted, however, that works undertaken for private ends which have no relation with his official duties would not be works of the sacred ministry.

Should the foregoing remarks seem inconclusive and the relaxations in favour of a priest given in the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* be restricted to works which are strictly those of the sacred ministry, attention could be drawn to the section (V.) which deals with relaxations available to the faithful. Here, one of the causes for mitigation of the fast is exhausting labour (*ab debilitantem laborem*). If the activities of the priest must be classed as those which belong to the faithful in general and are not properly priestly works, he is entitled to the same favours as the rest of the members of the Church. No one could deny him the right to receive holy Communion *more laicorum* after liquid refreshment needed because of hard work beforehand; and if he is still fasting for Communion, it is difficult to know why he could not celebrate Mass.² There seems no reason why a priest whose duties

²Before the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* (6th Jan., 1953), a relaxation of the Eucharistic fast was allowed to the sick after a month (Can. 858); but as they had to be confined to bed (*decumbentes*), the question of saying Mass could scarcely arise. Likewise, in the Formula Maior (n. 12), further concessions were at the disposal of Ordinaries in places subject to the S. Congregation

entail exhausting work in the early morning could not avail of the relaxation to take some liquid refreshment up to one hour before commencing Mass. He need not wait till after nine o'clock to go to the Altar. One may question the lawfulness of waiting till this hour just to avoid the inconvenience of the fast from midnight.

* * * *

MATRIMONIAL DISPENSATION AND DANGER TO MORALITY.

Dear Rev. Sir,

While giving instructions to a baptised non-Catholic in preparation for a mixed marriage, a priest learns that the couple intend to practise contraception for the first year of their married life. (There is no reason to suspect that matrimonial consent will be vitiated). The priest is satisfied that there is a canonical cause for the dispensation, but wonders if he should ask for it, since he cannot dissuade the couple from their evil intention. Is not a marriage which constitutes a danger to morals forbidden by the divine law no less than a union which is a danger to the faith? Should a priest give his help to bring about a state wherein the parties will frequently commit serious sin? Further, if the knowledge of the evil intention of the parties comes to light only after the dispensation has been granted should the priest proceed with the marriage?

INQUIRER.

REPLY.

The Priest may request the dispensation and assist at the Marriage. The reasons which would render this Marriage forbidden by the divine law are not those which follow from the different religions of the parties. Given a canonical cause and the observance of the prescribed *cautiones*, the dispensation can be granted from the ecclesiastical impediment. Once the dispensation is granted, the parties are private sinners who request the sacraments publicly, and they cannot be refused.

of Propaganda, but these also were only for the reception of Communion. The relaxations made available to priests in certain circumstances for Mass, in accordance with the Letter *Optime novit* (22nd March, 1923), were for the spiritual good of the faithful, expressly excluding the private devotion or good of the priest. The Constitution *Christus Dominus* seems to make no distinction between the fast for Communion and that for celebrating Mass. With regard to the sick, the concessions are given in the same number (II.). When it is question of inconvenience arising from work, exhausting labour (*ob debilitantem laborem*) is required for the faithful: and for the priest, onerous work of the sacred ministry (*post aravam sacri ministerii laborem*). If anything, the advantage would seem to be in favour of the priest, whose ministerial activities would not be physically so arduous.

The circumstance of difference of religion between two baptised persons, one of whom is a Catholic and the other a member of an heretical or schismatical sect, constitutes the impediment of *Mixta Religio*, which forbids marriage without invalidating the contract. The impediment, as such, is purely ecclesiastical in origin, though the legislator warns in Can. 1060 that where there is danger of perversion for the Catholic party or for the children, the marriage is also forbidden by the divine law. The Church is unwilling to relax her law by dispensation, unless precautions are taken to exclude the dangers which would make the union a proximate occasion of sin against the virtue of faith. Hence the *cautiones* are always required as a necessary condition for a dispensation from the ecclesiastical impediment. It is true that the Church could also demand precautions against possible violations of other precepts of the divine law, but she does not do so. The impediment of *Mixta Religio* is designed to protect the faith and to prevent the loss of present and future members of the one true Church. Like all the matrimonial impediments, it undoubtedly helps to safeguard the soul of the individual, but it is primarily for the good order of society and pertains to the external forum. When danger of loss of the faith is removed, a dispensation from the impediment will be granted for a grave reason.

Persons who enter the holy state of Matrimony with the intention of using unlawful means to frustrate the primary purpose of marriage are guilty of sin. Such a state of mind is not inconceivable even when both parties are Catholics. Should a priest be aware that they intend to abuse their sacred intimacies he would be bound to instruct them and endeavour to bring them to a realisation of their evil purposes; he may even point out that it would be better to remain single and observe God's law than to marry and commit sin, but he could not refuse to assist at their marriage. Marriage is a sacrament which must be received publicly, i.e., in the presence of witnesses: the good of society demands that it be a public contract. In the case of public sinners or those who are notoriously under censure, who refuse to go to confession or be reconciled with the Church, the parish priest is not to assist at their marriage unless for a grave reason, about which he should consult the Ordinary, if possible.³ This rule is a modified application of the principle that public sinners are to be refused the sacraments at all times; the modification being that for grave reasons they may receive the sacrament of Matrimony. We may suppose that the good of the other party and of the children requires that the marriage be permitted.

³Can. 1066.

With regard to sinners whose transgressions are known only to a few and are not likely to become public, to refuse them the Sacraments publicly would be the occasion of diffamation and a violation of the natural law.

*

*

*

*

APPROVAL OF FORBIDDEN MARRIAGE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Titius has decided to be married 'outside the Church'. His mother, who knows she cannot attend the ceremony at the Church, asks if she may go to the reception after the religious function. It would seem that her presence at the reception would be implicit approval of an unlawful act—the attempted marriage; and, on the other hand, there appears to be no law of the Church concerning wedding receptions.

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

It is not surprising that the ecclesiastical law is not concerned with wedding receptions. They are essentially social events, and the morality of attending them would depend on the circumstances and intention. The presumed reason for holding such receptions would be to give opportunity for friends to congratulate the newly-married couple and wish them happiness in their wedded life. They express socially much the same sentiments which the Church voices in her prayers during the Nuptial Mass: that bride and groom would see their children and their children's children to the third and the fourth generation and attain to a desired old age; that God would fill them with blessings, and hereafter give them life everlasting. For close relatives, the wedding reception would be a special occasion for rejoicing because a new branch of the family had been established, according to the laws of God and with the blessing of Mother Church.

Attendance at a wedding reception would normally imply approval of the wedding that has just been celebrated. For those who accept the invitation by free choice there seems little doubt that they wish to express congratulations on what has taken place and are in full agreement with it. Others may have to attend for official reasons, and with them the matter may be different—they may heartily disapprove of the whole affair, but circumstances make it difficult for them to be absent.

When the wedding is lawful, participation in the social activities that accompany it is also undoubtedly lawful. Not only marriages celebrated according to the rites of the Catholic Church, but also those of non-Catholics who marry between themselves are valid matrimonial

unions. Though we are forbidden—unless in exceptional recognised circumstances—to attend the religious ceremonies at non-Catholic weddings, we are not forbidden to take part in the receptions and other social celebrations that accompany them. It is fitting to congratulate non-Catholics on their marriage, and invitations to such wedding receptions may be freely accepted. This thought may have been behind the assertion in the query, that there appears to be no law of the Church concerning wedding receptions.

The attempted marriage of a Catholic in defiance of the laws of the Church is a different matter; it is an occasion not of rejoicing but of profound sorrow. No Catholic could approve of it, and much less the members of the family who grieve that their own flesh and blood has committed a crime punished by excommunication, and entered a life of habitual sin. The reception that follows is not rightly called a wedding reception for the reason there has been no wedding. Some may have to offer official congratulations or attend the reception out of sense of public civil duty, but their actions do not necessarily imply personal approval of the so called marriage. For private persons, there seems to be no such reason. Titius' mother surely should not stand by her son on the occasion of his rejection of the sacred loyalties she taught him. How could he or others interpret her action but as the bestowal of a maternal blessing on his disgraceful betrayal?

* * * *

CO-OPERATION IN UNLAWFUL OPERATIONS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In a certain hospital the medical practitioner has no scruple about performing operations to prevent child-birth. According to medical regulations, he may not operate without the assistance of a qualified nurse, whose work is to prepare the patient for the operation, set out the instruments in order, handle and receive them from the operating doctor. May a Catholic Nurse lawfully give such assistance which no other in the hospital is qualified to give? If she does so, is she liable to any canonical penalties?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

It is assumed that our correspondent has in mind certain operations which would render a woman sterile or incapable of bearing children. If the purpose of the operation be to remove a diseased organ which constitutes a danger to life or seriously interferes with the health of the woman, it may be performed lawfully, even though sterility neces-

sarily follows. A part of the body may be sacrificed for the good of the whole. There is no difficulty about assisting at such an operation. The removal of a healthy organ or the suppression of its functions to avoid the possibility of pregnancy is another matter and cannot be justified. The patient who submits to it, the surgeon and all who give consent are guilty of serious sin. The nurse would be bound to make it clear that she disapproved, and certainly could not offer to assist.

The question submitted concerns the actions of a nurse, who proximately co-operates in such an operation under orders from the medical superintendent, and in such circumstances that without her help the doctor could not proceed.

If we confine our attention to the order of physical causality, the principal efficient cause of the mutilation is the surgeon, who makes use of the actions of other persons, especially of the nurse, and directs them to the accomplishment of his purpose. In the moral order, the mutilation is evil and there is no doubt of the objective sin of the surgeon. What concerns us is the morality of the actions of the nurse. Apart from the fact that they are being availed of for a sinful end, it cannot be said that they are evil. Exactly the same actions would be performed when assisting at a lawful surgical operation. Does the circumstance of being directed towards an evil end by the free act of another affect the morality of her assistance and make it evil? It will depend on how far an external circumstance, namely, the employment of her otherwise innocent act as an instrument of sin, is the effect of her will. We cannot be held responsible for what is beyond our control, not only when we are physically unable to prevent it, but also when the labour entailed in doing so would be beyond what may be reasonably expected, after everything is taken into account. The virtue of charity obliges us to prevent the sin of another, since our love for our neighbour should prompt us to protect him from evil. Sometimes an obligation from another virtue is also involved—the virtue which is violated by the sin of the neighbour. In the present instance, it may seem that justice comes into play, since no private person has a right directly to mutilate another; but as the patient is a consenting party, no injustice is done her, according to the principle: *memor patitur nisi nolens*. Charity binds *sub gravi*; but its precepts cease to urge with a proportionate inconvenience to ourselves. We are not obliged to suffer as much in keeping another from harm, as he would undergo if we took no steps to stop him. Charity towards ourselves is more urgent than charity towards our neighbour. The obligation of preventing another from sinning

through the use of our actions will vary with the nature of our co-operation. The more proximately we are associated with the sinful act and the more necessary is our assistance, the greater must be the excusing cause. But as long as our act is not evil either in itself, by reason of the intention with which we do it, or because of some other circumstance, it is possible that the avoidance of sufficiently grave inconvenience to ourselves will justify our material co-operation. When such grave inconvenience is actually verified must be determined by exercise of the virtue of prudence; and in many cases we will have to be content with a probable opinion.

It is commonly said that no one would be obliged to deprive himself of a means of livelihood without hope of securing another position, in order to avoid material co-operation in the sin of a neighbour. Since many avenues of employment are open to nurses these days, it may seem that resignation is the only choice for a nurse who is asked to assist at unlawful operations. However, the question of the public good should not be overlooked in coming to a practical conclusion. While she remains, the Catholic nurse may be able to use her influence to prevent at least some of these operations, and at the same time do much for the spiritual good of her patients. If she goes elsewhere, her post will soon be filled by some other who, like the doctor, may not scruple about such operations. This consideration would also seem to weaken the force of the observation that no one else is qualified according to the civil law to give the assistance provided by the trained nurse. If she departs, the evil may stop for a brief space, but in the long run the general picture will be no brighter. Having regard to the general good, we would be slow to condemn a nurse who under orders from her superior (and no other) assisted, with evident reluctance, at an unlawful operation. But if she finds, after a fair trial, that requests for assistance are frequent, that her presence in the Hospital does not bring due compensations, and that the position is hopeless, the grave reason for material co-operation in the sins of the doctor and his patients—the promotion of the public good—would cease to have any force, and she should resign.

The penalty stated in law for grave mutilations is exclusion from legal ecclesiastical acts!⁴ but as it is not incurred unless the guilty person has been lawfully condemned, the nurse would not be affected

⁴Can. 2354. The list of legal ecclesiastical acts is given in Can. 2256, n. 2. Those which would concern the laity more particularly are the right to act as sponsor at Baptism and Confirmation.

by it, even in the case where her assistance were gravely sinful, unless criminal action against her were taken and succeeded. An ex-communication reserved to the Ordinary is incurred *ipso facto* by those who directly procure an abortion, provided the effect really follows. Assistance at an abortion which deprives the child of the hope of baptism and eternal salvation can never be justified; if there is a chance that the child will be delivered alive and can be baptised, very serious reasons may probably excuse the nurse from sin. A very urgent necessity would be required here, because there is question of an unjust attack on the life of the innocent child. We seriously doubt if such reasons would be ever verified in the case of a qualified nurse. The only exception we would make is if she did not know till the operation was in progress what its purpose was, and must remain to help save the unfortunate mother. When the nurse's assistance is necessary for procuring an abortion and her active participation gravely sinful, she incurs the excommunication mentioned in Can. 2350.

JAMES MADDEN.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE

CONFIRMATION STORIES by S.N.D., illustrated by "Anne," with preface by Patrick Rorke, S.J. (Sands & Co., 1955. 84 pp., 5/-).

The writer of these pleasant stories is a member of the religious Congregation founded by Blessed Julie Billiart. Other works of hers which Catholic teachers have found helpful are, True Stories for First Communicants, Ten Eager Hearts, First Communion Days. Her latest book will not disappoint. The illustrations are six pen-ink drawings which every boy and girl from seven to ten years of age will like. It is a book for the spiritual library of every class-room where it may be read with pleasure and profit by succeeding generations of children who are being led along the ways of God.

M. O.

Canon Law

JURISDICTION FOR HEARING CONFESSION OF SERIOUSLY ILL FEMALE RELIGIOUS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I would be grateful for a discussion of the following matter in the pages of the *A.C.R.* My problem is concerned with the confessor of sick women religious referred to in Canon 523. Let me put it this way. Father X, who possesses faculties in Diocese A for hearing the confessions of both men and women, is sojourning in Diocese B. He does not possess faculties to hear confessions in Diocese B. If a woman religious in Diocese B who is seriously ill requests him to hear her confession, can he validly do this?

After all, Canon 523 states that a woman religious who is seriously ill may summon to hear her confession any priest who is approved for the hearing of women's confessions. While I cannot claim to have made any detailed study of the question, I have always thought that this meant any priest approved for the confessions of women by any local Ordinary. Recently, however, my hitherto undisturbed tranquillity was shattered and confusion reigned supreme when I was informed that it meant only a priest approved for the hearing of women's confessions by the Ordinary of the place in which the confession is to be heard. Such a noted authority on Religious as Creusen was quoted against me. Is this true? Is there any ground for holding the opinion I have always felt to be the obvious one? I will be grateful for the removal of my confusion one way or the other.

VALDE PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

Canon 523 reads as follows: "All women religious who are seriously ill, even though they are not in danger of death, may summon *any priest approved for hearing the confessions of women*, even though he is not designated for the confessions of women religious, and confess to him as often as they wish during this serious illness; and the superioress may not prohibit them either directly or indirectly."

Our correspondent is not requesting a general commentary on Canon 523; his problem is concerned with the words which we have put in italics. In order to hear validly the confession of the sick religious, is it necessary that the priest should have been approved for the hearing of women's confessions by the Ordinary of the place in which the

religious house is situated? Or, as in the case presented by our correspondent, is it sufficient that he should be so approved by his own Ordinary, even though he has no faculty to hear the confessions of women in the diocese in which the religious house is situated?

It may afford some relief immediately to our correspondent if we state that at least the matter is disputed among canonists. Since our correspondent asks for a discussion of the matter, we will outline the two opinions and the arguments adduced to support them; and we will follow this with a practical conclusion which we believe may be safely adopted, at least until an authentic decision decides the question one way or the other.

The first opinion maintains that, although the term *Ordinarius loci* is not used in the canon, nevertheless the approval for hearing the confessions of women which is necessary in order that the priest may validly hear the confession of the sick religious must come from the Ordinary of the place in which the convent is situated. Our correspondent need not be surprised that Creusen favours this opinion; in fact, it is supported by the majority of the authors.

Creusen sums up the principal argument for this opinion when, after referring to the other opinion, he states: "But the general principle that delegated jurisdiction for hearing confessions must come from the Ordinary of the place keeps us from admitting the correctness of this interpretation" (Creusen, J., *Religious Men and Women in the Code*, 5th English Ed., Milwaukee, 1953, p. 29, n. 123). In other words, the canonists who hold this opinion base their position on the contents of Canon 874, I, which states: "The Ordinary of the place in which the confessions are heard is the one who grants delegated jurisdiction for hearing the confessions of all persons, both secular and religious, to all priests, secular and religious, even exempt religious..." Therefore, the holders of this opinion argue, what is maintained by the other opinion—namely, that the requisite approval in this case can come from another Ordinary and not necessarily from the Ordinary of the place in which the confession of the sick woman religious is to be heard—would seem very clearly to derogate from the principle set down in Canon 874, I.

The second opinion maintains that the approval for hearing the confessions of women which is necessary in order that the priest may validly hear the confession of the sick religious need not necessarily come from the Ordinary of the place in which the religious is situated; it is sufficient that the priest be approved for the hearing of women's

confessions by any local Ordinary. It has to be admitted that this opinion suffers by comparison with the first opinion if the argument from authority alone is considered. But there is good ground for saying that it compensates for this handicap by the reasons which can be adduced in its support.

As we have now seen, the first opinion rests its position on the principle set down in Canon 874, I. This second opinion, on the other hand, directs attention rather to Canon 876, which may be said to contain the following threefold ruling: (1) All secular and religious priests, no matter what their rank or office may be, need special jurisdiction to hear validly and lawfully the confessions of any and all women religious and novices: (2) The competent Ordinary to grant this special jurisdiction is the Ordinary of the place in which the house of the religious is situated: (3) This ruling does not prejudice the special provisions of Canons 239, I, I, 522, and 523.

It seems clear from (1) and (2) that Canon 876 is making a particular application in the matter of the confessions of women religious of the general principle contained in Canon 874, namely, that it is the local Ordinary who gives delegated jurisdiction for the hearing of confessions. However, it is also clear from (3) that the canon provides for three exceptions and that the point raised in our present query is affected. The exception contained in Canon 239 gives to Cardinals the power to hear the confessions of all anywhere in the world, even the confessions of women religious. In order to do this lawfully and validly they do not need any jurisdiction from the local Ordinary. The jurisdiction in the case is granted by the law itself; and it is important to note that fact since it is an essential factor for our reasoning in regard to our present query. The exception of Canon 522 relates to the occasional confessor who is approached by a woman religious for confession for the peace of her conscience. If such a priest is approved by the Ordinary of the place for hearing the confessions of women—even though not approved by the local Ordinary for the confessions of women religious—he can validly and lawfully hear the confession of the woman religious. But in this case also, as in the previous exception relating to Cardinals, the jurisdiction to hear the confession of the woman religious does not come from the local Ordinary himself. It is granted by the law itself; and it is simply required as a condition for the conferral of this jurisdiction by the law that the local Ordinary should have approved the priest to hear the confessions of women.

The third exception—that of Canon 523—is actually the matter

with which our query is concerned. It means that the case contemplated in this canon (523) is to be regarded as an exception to the rule that the Ordinary of the place grants the special jurisdiction to hear the confessions of women religious; in this case, too the law itself explicitly gives the requisite jurisdiction provided the conditions expressed in Canon 523 are fulfilled. One of these conditions, as set down in this canon, is that the priest should be approved for the hearing of women's confessions; and it cannot be argued that this approval must come from the Ordinary of the place since Canon 876 makes Canon 523 an exception to the general rule and the law itself (in Canon 523) confers the necessary jurisdiction in the particular case.

Moreover, the first opinion, in claiming that the required approval for the hearing of women's confessions should come from the *Ordinarius loci*, is really introducing into the canon a phrase that is not actually used by the legislator. The second opinion maintains that the omission of the phrase in this canon takes on the nature of a very deliberate omission, especially when it is considered that this phrase was carefully inserted in the previous canon (522), although, if one adopts the line of reasoning of the first opinion, this should not have been necessary. When the legislator in one canon requires approval by the *Ordinarius loci* for the hearing of women's confessions (Can. 522), and in the following canon requires simply approval for the hearing of women's confessions, there is good reason for maintaining that he has deliberately omitted the requirement that the approval should come from the Ordinary of the place in question. In any case it would have been a very easy matter to insert the words *Ordinarius loci* if that is what the legislator intended; and this also makes their omission appear to be a purposeful act on the part of the legislator.

Moreover, this greater liberality which this second opinion attributes to the legislator, is undoubtedly in keeping with the fact that Canon 523 is concerned with a seriously ill religious; and the legislator, therefore, is rather less restrictive than in the previous canon in which such an eventuality is not contemplated. This greater liberality is patently consistent with the increased urgency that exists on account of the serious illness envisaged by Canon 523.

CONCLUSION: In the absence of any authoritative decision to the contrary our personal preference is towards the second opinion for the reasons already given. In any case, we believe that the following practical conclusion is justified: If the value of an opinion depends primarily on the weight of the arguments upon which it is based, and not solely on

the number of canonists in its favour, then it is to be admitted that the second opinion in this matter enjoys at least a reasonable probability. Consequently, although many authors adopt the first opinion as a matter of course, we feel that at least there exists a doubt of law (*dubium iuris*) on the point. Now Canon 209 states: "In common error or in positive and probable doubt of law or of fact, the Church supplies jurisdiction for both the internal and external forum." Consequently, if a priest who is approved for hearing the confessions of women by the Ordinary of a place other than the place in which the seriously ill woman religious is, were to hear the confession of that religious, the confession would be valid and lawful in the light of the ruling of Canon 209.

*

*

*

*

MARRIAGE CASE CONCERNING DISPARITY OF CULT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

It is possible that a baptized Catholic, born of a Mixed Marriage, could have been married validly outside the Church before 1st January, 1949, because, in certain circumstances, such a Catholic would not have been bound by the canonical form of marriage. Would it have been possible for such a Catholic who was not bound by the canonical form to have contracted an invalid marriage outside the Church on the ground that the non-Catholic party was never baptized? In other words, would a Catholic who was not bound by the canonical form of marriage, have been bound by the invalidating impediment of Disparity of Cult?

STUDENT.

REPLY.

The answer to the query of our correspondent is in the affirmative; that is, such a Catholic, although not bound by the canonical form of marriage, would have been bound by the diriment impediment of disparity of cult. Consequently, the marriage would have been invalid on this ground. The following discussion of the query may be of interest, especially since it will bring out the reason behind the query. That reason may not be immediately evident from the way in which the question has been proposed.

Before 1st January, 1949, Canon 1099, 2, read as follows: "Without prejudice to the prescriptions of I, n. I, non-Catholics, whether baptized or not baptized, if they contract marriage among themselves, are nowhere bound to observe the Catholic form of marriage; and, likewise, those born of non-Catholic parents, even though they have been baptized in the Catholic Church, who have grown up from infancy in

heresy or schism or infidelity, or without any religion, as often as they contract marriage with a non-Catholic." It is clear, therefore, that in certain circumstances a baptized Catholic who was married outside the Church before that date, could have contracted a marriage that would not have been invalid on the ground of lack of canonical form. The question is: Would such a person, although not bound by the canonical form of marriage, have been bound by the impediment of disparity of cult, so that the marriage would have been invalid on this ground if the non-Catholic party had not been baptized?

There was a difference of opinion on this point. There were canonists who maintained that the impediment of disparity of cult did not apply in such a case. In effect, these held that the phrase *baptizata in ecclesia catholica* of Canon 1070 should be interpreted in the light of the authentic decision given concerning that part of Canon 1099, 2, which has now been abrogated. This means that baptized Catholics *ab acatholicis nati* should not be regarded as Catholics as far as the impediment of disparity of cult was concerned whenever they were not regarded as Catholics as far as the canonical form of marriage was concerned. Applying this to the case presented by our correspondent it would mean that the marriage from this point of view would have been considered as a marriage between two non-Catholics; and, since the impediment of disparity of cult no longer binds baptized non-Catholics as it did before the Code, the marriage would not be invalid since the impediment of disparity of cult would not have existed.

Other canonists, however, maintained that in such a case the freedom from the obligation of observing the canonical form of marriage did not carry with it freedom also from the impediment of disparity of cult. Therefore, they held that such a marriage as that contemplated by our correspondent would be invalid on the ground of the existence of the diriment impediment of disparity of cult. In their view the ruling of Canon 1099, 2, applied only to the matter of the canonical form of marriage, and there was nothing in Canon 1070 to suggest that it should be interpreted in the light of Canon 1099, 2, or any authoritative decision affecting that canon. Such an interpretation would appear to be purely arbitrary. Moreover, no exception is even hinted at in Canons 1070-1071 which are concerned with disparity of cult.

This view received support from a private reply given by the Holy Office through the Congregation of Propaganda Fide on 1st April, 1922. This private decision was concerned with the case of a child, born of infidel parents, who was baptized in infancy by a Catholic doctor because the child was in danger of death. The child, ignorant of this baptism,

was brought up in infidelity, and towards the end of 1918 married an unbaptized girl. Subsequently, he learned of his Catholic baptism. The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda was asked whether the marriage of this man was valid. The Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office (cf. Canon 247 concerning the competency of this Congregation) replied through the Congregation of Propaganda that the marriage was invalid on the ground of disparity of cult. It appears to be clear that the marriage, even though contracted by a baptized Catholic outside the Church, would not have been invalid on the ground of defective form since the man—in accordance with Canon 1099, 2, as it then was—would not have been bound by the canonical form (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. I, pp. 511-512). Consequently, the above reply, although private, seemed to make it clear that the view of the Holy Office was that a baptized Catholic was bound by the impediment of disparity of cult even though he was not bound by the canonical form of marriage.

Finally, the matter has now been definitely decided by the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Code in a reply issued on 29th April, 1940. The Code Commission was asked: "Whether the persons born of non-Catholics, mentioned in Canon 1099, 2, are bound, according to Canon 1070, by the impediment of disparity of cult when they contract marriage with an unbaptized person? Reply: In the affirmative" (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. II, p. 290).

G. C. GALLEN.

Liturgy

PRIEST AND PEOPLE AT MASS.

Some fifty-three years have elapsed since Pope St. Pius X declared, in words so often quoted, that the active participation of the faithful in the Sacred Mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church is the primary and indispensable source from which they will imbibe the true christian spirit. Pope Pius XI repeated the teaching of his predecessor when he affirmed that 'it is truly necessary that the faithful should not assist at the sacred rites as merely detached and silent onlookers, but should be filled with a sense of the beauty of the liturgy and sing alternately with the priest and the schola cantorum as the rubrics prescribe.' (Constitution: *Divini cultus*, 1929). The encyclical letter *Mediator Dei* on the Sacred Liturgy issued by the reigning Pontiff in 1947 contains very many expressions of the same doctrine. We must be content to quote his exhortation to the bishops of the Church: 'Strive earnestly, also, by methods and means which your prudence judges most effective, to bring about a close union of mind and heart between clergy and people; that the faithful may take so active a part in the liturgy that it becomes really a sacred action in which both priest—especially the priest in his own parish—and people join in offering to Almighty God to worship that is his due' (Trans. E.C.T.S., § 212).

Zealous pastors everywhere have endeavoured to comply with these instructions of the Vicars of Christ. The task has not been easy, the faithful were in need of no little instruction, but one might safely say that a great deal of the ground work has been completed and men are now far more familiar with the idea that they come to Mass, not merely to fulfil an obligation by bodily presence, but to unite themselves with the Sacrifice which Christ offers to his heavenly Father on their behalf.

The realization of this ideal generally calls for some degree of external activity on the part of the congregation. Mind and body are complimentary elements of human nature, and the external expression of our thoughts serves to intensify the thoughts themselves; the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass are sufficient proof of this, for they produce and maintain in a most effective way the active union of our mind and heart with Christ the Victim of the Sacrifice.

The question naturally presents itself: What form should this activity take? The rubrics of the Missal and the instructions of the Holy See indicate a number of different methods which may be profit-

ably employed; the congregation may recite or sing various responses or chants. For the most part such directions are of a general character and require application to varying circumstances. Furthermore, the specific application of the general norms demands an understanding of the Mass as an act of public worship made up of a number of parts of different kinds. The activity of the faithful, to be appropriate and effective, must be directed towards the sacrificial act of Christ which is renewed in the Mass. It is not simply a question of singing hymns or reciting prayers; the hymns and prayers must be selected to harmonize with the prayers and rites of the Mass, for by these the Church unfolds in authentic fashion the meaning of the Sacrifice. The purpose of the present article is, then, to recall certain fundamental aspects of the liturgy of the Mass and in the light of these principles to determine how in practice the activity of the faithful might be realized. In this way one might hope to avoid solutions which are not truly satisfactory.

The Council of Trent has taught us that Christ our Lord 'at the Last Supper, on the night on which he was being betrayed, willed to leave to his beloved Bride the Church a visible sacrifice such as the nature of man requires' (Sess. xxii). Men have the duty to offer to their Creator a worship worthy of Him. Man must worship Him as an individual, he must worship Him in union with his fellow-men, and this worship must be given by the whole man, body and soul. Sacrifice is the supreme form of this worship due to God. The nature of man, therefore, requires a visible sacrifice, in a word, an act of divine worship that is at once internal and external, individual and social, and enables man to discharge his duty towards his Creator. For this purpose Christ instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice which renews daily the perfect and infinite sacrifice of the Cross. The Mass is the act of 'supreme homage by which Christ, the principal offerer, and with Him and through Him all his mystical members, pay due honour and veneration to God' (M.D. § 98).

'Every time the priest re-enacts what the divine Redeemer did at the Last Supper, the Sacrifice is really accomplished; and this Sacrifice, always and everywhere, necessarily and of its very nature, has a public and social Character. For he who offers it acts in the name both of Christ and of the faithful, of whom the divine Redeemer is the Head, and he offers it to God for the holy Catholic Church' (M.D. § 101). Private devotion may inspire the priest to say Mass, but the Mass is not an act of private devotion—of its nature it always has a *public* and *social* character. The presence or absence of a congregation does not affect

the validity of the priest's act nor change its public character. The celebrant should even at a private Mass endeavour to realize the import of his action for the whole Church, its universal dimension, and when he offers the holy Sacrifice for the benefit of the assembled faithful, it is reasonable to demand that he make a greater effort to take account of the public nature of his ministry, that his action is both intrinsically and extrinsically the solemn act of worship being offered to God by the assembly of his children. If it is the duty of the faithful to unite their minds and hearts with the priest, and through him with Christ, so we priests must strive to associate the people with us and with Christ the High Priest and Victim of the Sacrifice. This is but a simple deduction from the nature of the Mass, but it does seem to be of vital importance in moulding our attitude to the way in which we celebrate Mass and the efforts we make to bring the congregation into closer union with the holy Sacrifice. Allowance must always be made for personal dispositions, but it is surely logical to accommodate these to the public nature of our ministry, rather than fit the latter to our personal dispositions. The Mass is the public worship offered to God by the assembly of christians, the worship of the members of the Mystical Body united with their Divine Head, Jesus Christ.

When the people of God assemble around the altar of Sacrifice, all the members of the assembly do not possess the same power and hence all are not equally competent to perform the act of public worship. The Church is by divine institution a *hierarchical* society and the public worship it offers God reflects this property of the Church. As the Holy Father expresses it: 'The fact that the faithful take part in the Eucharistic Sacrifice does not mean that they also possess the power of the priesthood' (M.D. § 86). On the other hand, the same Pontiff has reminded us that 'by reason of their baptism christians are in the Mystical Body and become by a common title members of Christ the Priest; by the 'character' that is graven upon their souls they are appointed to the worship of God, and therefore, according to their condition, they share in the priesthood of Christ Himself' (M.D. 91). By virtue of the power conferred upon him at Ordination, the priest acts in the person of Christ, he alone makes present on the altar the divine Victim of the Sacrifice and the power to accomplish this comes to him from God not by deputation from the people. Because the priest represents the person of Christ considered as Head of all the members and offering Himself for them, the priest acts in the name of the people. In this sense we understand the prayers of the Mass recited in the first

person plural, as for example the prayer before the Consecration: 'We therefore pray thee, O Lord, graciously to accept this offering which we, thy servants, and thy whole family make unto thee.' The priesthood of the faithful is the participation or association, in the collective sense, in the priestly function of Christ, and of his ministers, which results from the incorporation of the individual into the unity of the Mystical Body. This dignity gives to the simple christian the right to participate actively in the Holy Sacrifice; he is not merely a spectator but a living member of the Mystical Body of Christ, the High and Eternal Priest.

The understanding of this relationship between each christian and Christ, and of the hierarchical nature of the Church is intimately connected with the external form of the liturgical action of the Mass. It leads us to the foundation of the teaching in the matter of the active participation of the faithful for it shows us why certain parts of the Mass are carried out by the faithful, e.g., the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus and Agnus Dei, while other parts belong to the priest alone, e.g., the Preface, Canon, etc. The celebrant will invite the congregation to unite with him in prayer, and the people will express their assent to the act of the celebrant by their responses, because they are united to Christ by the supernatural bonds of the Mystical Body. We shall see a little later on the practical application of these fundamental truths.

One further point must be made before we descend to details. In the course of the centuries the Church, ever guided by the inspirations of her divine Founder, has formed around the essential form of the Sacrament of the Eucharist a series of prayers and ceremonies. These external elements were demanded by the composite nature of man and by the nature of the Mass as an act of public worship. An atmosphere of faith had to be created before the sacred mysteries were performed, and this is achieved by the service of prayer, of readings from the Scriptures and of instruction by the ministers of the Gospel which make up the Fore-Mass. The gifts of the Sacrifice, to become the Body and Blood of Christ, are prepared at the Offertory. The celebrant recites the prayer of the Canon expressing the nature of the sublime mystery accomplished by the words of Consecration. Finally, the prayers of the Communion rite reveal the sentiments with which we should approach the Holy Table. These external formulas and actions make up the act of public worship of the Church, and they manifest its social and hierarchical character. Consequently, in determining the form of the active participation of the faithful in the Mass, we must take account of

the historical origin of the various parts of the Mass in regulating the respective roles of celebrant, ministers, choir and congregation.

In the second part of this article, we come to consider the practical aspects of the active participation of the faithful in the Mass; the actual forms that it may take. Since the encyclical *Mediator Dei* a great deal has been published by various writers and a number of Bishops have issued directives for their own dioceses. As a result of these discussions many ideas have been clarified and we are now in a position to reach a fairly satisfactory solution of many of the problems that arise. The rubrics of the Missal and decisions of the Holy See will determine many details, but other suggestions, as will be noted, would require the permission of the Local Ordinary before being implemented.¹

HIGH MASS.

While we are well aware that the absence of Sacred Ministers places the High Mass beyond the limits of possibility in our average parish except on special occasions, yet it still remains the ideal form of the supreme act of public worship offered to God by his holy people. The Low Mass in its origin and external form has a private character, although as explained above this in no way diminishes its essential public and social nature. Pope Pius XII drew attention to the excellence of the High Mass when he wrote: 'The "dialogue" Mass cannot be substituted for the solemn High Mass; this, even though celebrated with only the sacred ministers present, has a dignity all its own by reason of the solemnity of its rites and the splendour of its ceremonies; although such splendour and solemnity are greatly enhanced if, as the Church earnestly desires, a large and devout congregation assists at it' (M.D. § 113). The High Mass effectively portrays the social unity of the Christian assembly as also the hierarchical distinction between its various members, because the celebrant, the sacred ministers, the choir and the people have each their respective parts to sing, the sum total of which make up the solemn act of worship. The present rubrics required the celebrant to read privately even the texts of the Mass which are sung by others, but this procedure is something of an anomaly and, in light of the change introduced in the Restored Order of Holy Week, we may hope for a similar adjustment of the rubrics for every High Mass.

¹For Bologna, Cardinal Lecaro has published *A Messa figlioli* (2nd edit., 1956). His Eminence notes in the Preface that the book has been reviewed by several liturgists, including Archbishop Carinci, Secretary of the Congregation of Rites, hence we may regard it as proposing 'safe doctrine.' The directives concern only the Low Mass. A number of French Bishops have also issued similar instructions and it seems that a general instruction for the whole of France is under consideration.

Under the same heading, we understand the incongruity of omitting to sing the Proper of the Mass, a practice that has been condemned. The Gregorian melodies of the Proper may be above the capacity of a less experienced choir, but the use of psalm-tones for the Proper presents no serious obstacle to an ordinary choir.

Restrictions imposed by circumstances may sometimes lead us to overlook the fact that the responses to the *Dominus vobiscum*, the *Amen* at the end of the prayers and the end of the Canon, etc., together with the Gloria, Credo, Sanctus and Agnus Dei are properly chants of the whole congregation and not merely the group of people in the choir gallery. Admittedly, it would be impossible to expect the whole congregation to break forth into song at the next High Mass or Missa cantata, but there are a few points worth considering. Many will depend on the school-children to do the singing, could we not ensure that the school choir is as large as possible? If all cannot be trained to sing all the above chants, they are capable of joining in the responses, and this will be one step forward in a long range policy, for the children of to-day are the adults of to-morrow. Against this background, the purpose of Gregorian Chant and the need to teach it in our schools becomes evident, for familiarity with the chant will enable the people to exercise their right and privilege to take an active part in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. It is forbidden, except by permission of the Holy See, to sing chants in the vernacular during a High Mass or a Missa Cantata.

We may be permitted to submit to the consideration of the appropriate authorities a suggestion about the High Mass or Missa cantata which is customarily celebrated in seminaries and religious houses on Sundays and feast-days. Granted the excellence and the nature of the sung Mass and the further fact that by the reception of Holy Communion the congregation gain more abundant fruit from the Sacrifice, it would seem desirable that the sung Mass should be the principal or community Mass for the day rather than a second Mass of devotion. It would make possible also the adoption of another custom which the Church has commended to us in the Restored Order of Holy Week, namely the singing of appropriate psalms during the Communion. In this way we might develop in our future priests and religious a deeper appreciation of the social unity of priest and faithful at Mass.

MISSA CANTATA.

What has been said of the High Mass is applicable to the Missa cantata. The celebrant reads the Epistle; if a tonsured cleric is present

he may sing it. When the Epistle is not sung, some Bishops have approved the reading of the Epistle in the vernacular by a lector, either cleric or layman, while it is being read by the celebrant.

LOW MASS.

As previously stated, the external rite of the Low Mass, in which everything is recited by the priest, differs greatly in form from the sung Mass and thus leaves room for a large measure of liberty in determining the form of participation by the people. The episcopal directives that have been issued pay special attention to the Low Mass because of this greater liberty and because the Low Mass is the more common form of celebration. The participation takes one of three forms: a. Dialogue Mass; b. Singing of appropriate chants by the people in the vernacular; c. Recitation of appropriate prayers by the people in the vernacular. It is also possible to combine some of the features of each form.

a. *The Dialogue Mass.* The permission of the Local Ordinary is required and any instructions that he may issue regarding its form must be observed. The usual form of the Dialogue Mass is for the people to recite those responses and texts of the Mass which are sung by the people in a High Mass, such as Kyrie, Gloria, etc. Thus the celebrant intones the Gloria and the people recite it with him in unison, or alternately amongst themselves in two groups. The celebrant must recite the whole hymn, he may not alternate the verses with the congregation. In smaller and more experienced congregations, e.g., in a religious community, it is suggested that all might answer the responses made by the server namely, the prayers at the foot of the altar, *Deo gratias* after the Epistle and Last Gospel *Laus tibi, Christe* after the Gospel, and the reply to the *Orate Fratres*. The short responses after the epistle and gospel are usually not recommended for a large congregation because of the difficulty of achieving unison, and the *Suscipiat* is regarded as too much of a tongue-twister. As to the prayers at the foot of the altar, they are difficult for all to master, and, moreover, they are in character a private preparation of the celebrant, as appears from the sung Mass, so it seems preferable to leave them to the servers at all times. Likewise, some suggest that the people should recite the Confiteor before the Communion, and the *Domine non sum dignus* three times with the celebrant, others do not concur with this opinion. Speaking of these prayers, Father Jungmann remarks: 'in our day, when we have learned to follow the procedure of the Mass from start to finish, we find the Confiteor especially a rather unnecessary repetition, since, even with-

out considering the community type of Mass, every attempt to participate at the sacrifice demands from the very beginning the humble acknowledgment of sin' (*The Mass of the Roman Rite*, ii, p. 373). The Restored Order of Holy Week omits the Confiteor before Communion on Holy Thursday. What will be said later of vernacular hymns and prayers is applicable to the Dialogue Mass if they are used during such a Mass.

b. *Vernacular prayers and hymns during Low Mass.* The specific details of this form of popular participation must be guided by certain principles. The object of the prayers and chants is to *unite* the congregation with the Holy Sacrifice being offered by the priest, to give external expression to the essential unity of this act of worship of the holy people of God. The hierarchical character of the liturgical rite of the Mass must be preserved and this may be done by keeping in mind the forms of the High Mass. The hymns and prayers selected must be apposite, a selection of popular English hymns will not be satisfactory, and the same may be said of the singing of the Kyrie, Gloria, etc., in Latin. The voice of the priest must be heard at the proper times, the silence of the people during these intervals is as an effective act of participation as when they are singing or reciting their own prayers. At all costs we must avoid two parallel actions, one by the priest at the altar reciting the prayers in Latin, and the other by the people in the body of the church reciting the very same prayers in English. The central role of the celebrant must be maintained. If another priest is present to direct the congregation and to add some comments by way of explanation, writers unanimously insist that the commentary be as brief as possible and always written out beforehand. The task of the commentator is to direct the attention of the congregation to the celebrant and the altar, not to himself. These principles will become more evident in the following outline.

THE ENTRANCE RITE (Beginning of Mass to the Collect). During the prayers at the foot of the altar, the congregation sings or recites in Latin or English a chant or prayer appropriate to the season or feast. For instance, a psalm sung in responsorial fashion, i.e., the choir sings a short antiphon or refrain of simple melody, which is repeated by the congregation after each verse of the psalm; the choir alone sings the verses. This could be concluded as the priest finishes the Introit. If the people are silent during the Introit, it is generally recommended that a translation of the Introit or the other parts of the Proper should

not be read by another priest or lector, as this tends to withdraw attention from the celebrant.

The people might alternate the *Kyrie* with the celebrant, and if they do not recite the Gloria as in a Dialogue Mass, they might sing or recite a short paraphrase of the hymn in English. Here again, paraphrases are preferred to full translations of the prayers as this avoids what Cardinal Lecaro has termed 'a Liturgy in the vernacular' (*A Messa figlioli*, p. 17). This prayer or chant will be finished before the priest greets the people and summons them to attention with *Dominus vobiscum*, to which they respond.

The Collect is the prayer of the celebrant, therefore no translation is read by a commentator. At most, some e.g. Cardinal Lecaro, would allow the commentator to indicate the content of the prayer in this manner (1st Sunday after Epiphany): 'On behalf of us and the Church the celebrant asks that the people of God may receive the light to know their duty and the strength to fulfil it.' The people signify their assent to the petition by answering *Amen*.

THE READINGS. Nearly all the episcopal directives published provide for the reading of the Epistle and Gospel in the vernacular. The epistle may be read by a lector or commentator, even a layman, while the celebrant is reading it at the altar. The gospel, however, is usually reserved to a deacon or priest, hence, if a priest or deacon is present he might read the gospel while the celebrant is reading it, otherwise it should be read by the celebrant himself after he has read it in Latin. The people make the responses to the celebrant at the beginning of the Gospel before the reader begins. Between the two scriptural readings, a chant or prayer is sung or recited as at the Introit. The *Mundacor meum* is not recited by the people as it is a private prayer of the celebrant. A short homily on either the epistle or gospel is generally recommended as part of the general movement to restore the instruction of the faithful to its traditional position in the liturgy of the Word. For example, the Bishop of Tournai has recently laid down the rule in his diocese that the short homily must follow immediately after the gospel; the notices, if any, will come after the homily and then may follow the sermon or instruction, if it is on a subject other than the readings of the Mass (cfr. *Paroisse et liturgie*, 1956, p. 413).

The Creed may be said by the people with the celebrant as in the Dialogue Mass or, adopting the same method as for the Gloria, the people may sing or recite, in English, the Apostles Creed or a paraphrase of the Creed of the Mass.

THE OFFERTORY. The congregation replies to the *Dominus vobiscum*. Some form of offertory procession is commonly proposed. It might be of interest to record the forms of the offertory procession approved by Cardinal Lecaro for his diocese.

- A. Normally only the matter for the Sacrifice should be carried to the altar: the particles in the ciborium, the cruets of wine and water. Occasionally two or more candles may be added and these will be lighted from the Consecration until the Communion. The flowers may be placed on the altar at this time, and they will serve to indicate, in some fashion, the beginning of the part of the Mass that will conclude when the congregation will assemble around the Lord's table.
 - a) A small procession of gift-bearers (boys, men, altar-boys) comes to the altar in an orderly manner; it would be well to give the procession a fair space to cover. The gift-bearers genuflect and offer the gifts to the celebrant.
 - b) The collectors, meantime, may take up the collection amongst the congregation.
 - c) The choir intones the offertory chant (selected and sung as the Introit).
 - d) The congregation repeats the refrain of the chant.
- B. The offering of the bread may be made more personal:
 - a) In the case of a small congregation, the altar-boys might pass amongst the faithful, one presenting a vessel containing the particles and the other the ciborium; each communicant places a particle in the ciborium.
 - b) When the congregation is more numerous, the vessel and ciborium may be placed in a convenient position near the entrance to the church, in order that those who wish to receive Communion may place a particle in the ciborium as they enter the church.

In both cases, motives of hygiene demand the use of a small pair of tongs.

- C. Only in very special circumstances is any extension of the gifts offered by the faithful opportune. (The Cardinal gives as examples the 'Charity Mass,' at which gifts in kind and money are offered for the poor; the offering of wheat or grapes at the thanksgiving feast after the harvest or vintage).

In such cases, special attention must be paid to good order so that it will be a proper offertory procession.

If women present offerings these are to be received at the altar rails. (*op. cit.*, pp. 43-45).

Having received the offerings, the celebrant proceeds to offer the bread and wine, meantime the people continue the offertory chant or prayer, concluding before the Preface. The prayers recited by the celebrant at the Offertory are personal in character, designed to accompany the actions performed by the celebrant, and not intended to be said by the people. The *Orate Fratres* may be recited by all or, rather better, only by the servers.

THE CANON. All answer the responses at the beginning of the Preface, which marks the start of the prayer of the celebrant. A translation of the Preface must not be read by a commentator. The Sanctus is recited by all in Latin, together with the celebrant or a paraphrase may be sung or recited in English by the congregation. The singing of the Sanctus in Latin at a Low Mass is not recommended.

During the Canon the congregation should not recite any prayers aloud in English. Some suggest that a commentator might indicate very briefly the theme of some prayers of the Canon, especially when this form of assisting at Mass is being first introduced, e.g., after the Elevation: 'Christ is present on the altar as the Victim of the Sacrifice; he offers himself to the Father; the Church offers him and is offered with him.' A short chant expressing these same ideas is sometimes admitted after the Consecration. The congregation voices its union with the Sacrifice of Christ in answering the *Amen* at the end of the Canon.

COMMUNION RITE. The *Pater noster* is also the prayer of the celebrant, who recites it in the name of all; the people signify their union with the priest by answering: *Sed libera nos a malo*. Similarly they answer the responses after the Fractio.

The Agnus Dei is recited with the celebrant, or an appropriate form of it is sung or recited in English. The reading aloud in English of the three prayers after the Agnus Dei is not recommended. Some allow the congregation to recite in Latin the Confiteor, and *Domine non sum dignus*, but others, as mentioned earlier, do not agree with this suggestion. The faithful should come to Communion in an orderly manner, so that it is a true procession, and while Communion is being distributed suitable chants are recommended.

The Postcommunion is arranged as the Collect. All make the responses after the *Ite Missa est*, and the blessing. The Last Gospel is not an instructional reading, but a prayer of devotion recited by the celebrant, and therefore should not be read aloud in English.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

It is hoped that this outline of some aspects of the Mass as a liturgical rite enshrining the great Mystery of Faith and their application to the several forms of the Mass will have given us a better understanding of the way in which the participation of the faithful in the rite may be developed. The successful introduction of these methods will call for a period of careful instruction of the faithful as to how these external forms will lead them to a closer interior union with Christ, Priest, and Victim of the Sacrifice. Some reorientation on the part of the celebrant in his devotional approach to the Mass may also be required, for we, no less than the faithful, can become rather individualistic in our attitude to the Mass. Finally may we repeat that some of these methods require the approval of the Local Ordinary, hence *nihil sine Episcopo*. 'It is the right and duty of Bishops, in their turn, to enforce vigilantly the observance of the canonical rules on divine worship. Therefore private individuals even among the clergy cannot be allowed any interference with these sacred matters' (M.D. § 62). The approval given by a Bishop to one or other of the methods described above does not extend beyond the limits of his own territory, and does not justify its immediate adoption by private individuals in other places.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

CHARITY THE SUM OF THE LAW.

The continuation of St. Paul's summary of duties towards the civil government (Rom. 13: 1-7) is an elegant passage from the splendid virtue of justice, without which social morality can have no basis, to the virtue which is the very sun and life-fountain of the Christian regime—the queen-virtue of charity. The Apostle had summed up the debts of legal justice: obedience to authority not only through fear of punishment but for conscience sake, the showing of signs of submission by paying taxes and giving to every civil functionary his due: tribute to whom the debt of tribute is owing, custom-dues to whom custom-dues are owing, reverence to whom reverence is owing, honour to whom honour is owing.

From this restriction of the term justice to the legal obligations of subjects, the notion enlarges itself and the Apostle elegantly carries on the idea of debt into the greater sphere of charity.

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another. For he who loves the other has fulfilled the law. For what [is commanded thus, namely]: Thou shalt not commit adultery: Thou shalt not kill: Thou shalt not steal (Thou shalt not bear false witness): Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Charity works no evil to the neighbour. Therefore charity is the fulness of the law."

This passage, which is the Epistle of the fourth Sunday after Epiphany holds quite a treasure of instruction, for it allows the homilist to use much that he has learned in his treatises on the commandments of the Decalogue.

The extinction of debts of justice should, as far as possible, be a primary concern of every Christian. St. Paul's precept: "Owe no one anything," means that to the utmost of our power we should meet our debts. Many have a good intention in regard to the payment of debts but, nevertheless, delay payment, which can be a really unjust keeping of what belongs to another. Even the Old Law insisted on prompt payments: "The wages of him who is hired shall not remain with thee all night till the morning" (Lev. 19: 13). Even for the debtor's own sake, acquittance of his obligation is wisdom, for indebtedness is a slavery.

There are, of course, debts that can never be paid. We have, for instance benefactors, God Himself, and others under God, to whom we

can never render the equivalent of their benefactions. Such especially is the debt we owe to our parents.

St. Paul points to a debt which likewise always holds its claims over us. It is charity. "Owe nothing to anyone but to love one another." The motive of christian charity is God and the precept of fraternal charity is Christ's own special precept. Seeing that we love our fellow-men because of God's image in them by nature and grace, we can never say we have loved enough. We can never say that we have satisfied God's totalitarian claim on us sufficiently. Besides, love grows on loving and consequently its demands are always becoming more imperious.

The Apostle gives a plain and telling reason for his insistence on charity. The exercise of charity involves the fulfilment of the whole law; in fact it is the fulfilment of the law. "He who loves the other has fulfilled the law." In the Greek text the word law is not preceded by the article. Consequently, it is possible, that St. Paul in this place and in this letter to the Romans, who were a people of law, means not only the law of Moses but all law from whatsoever legislative source. Charity is actually a total subjection to the ordering will of God. And charity has no limits but the love of the Eternal Father and His Christ for the members of the human race. It was with immediate reference to charity that Christ said: "Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5: 48).

St. Paul proves his point by citing some of the commandments in particular: four from the second table (the Clementine Vulgate, with some Greek codices, has a fifth, namely, Thou shalt not bear false witness). The order of the commandments in our text will surprise some members of our congregation. There seems to be no reason whatever for thinking that St. Paul deliberately changed the order, putting: "Thou shalt not commit adultery" before "Thou shalt not kill." It is true that the Masoretic and Hebrew text of Exodus and Deuteronomy give these commandments in the order familiar to us, and MSS of the Septuagint likewise. But the oldest known Hebrew text of the Decalogue, the papyrus Nash, together with the Alexandrian Philo and Codex Vaticanus has this Pauline order. It is only just necessary to note this, for it has no homiletic importance unless the preacher wishes to give his audience a little excursus on the division and order of the Decalogue.

St. Paul is dealing with the love of neighbour. Therefore he does not quote any of the three commandments of the first table and, omitting the positive precept: "Honour thy father and thy mother" he quotes

four negative precepts, to show that charity excludes all evil-doing towards one's neighbour. There is a special reason for choosing the negative precepts apart even from the fact that the Decalogue with the exception of the Sabbath-precept and the Honour-to-parents precept are all formulated negatively. Negative precepts are more universal and, as theologians point out, they oblige *semper et ad semper*.

The homilist may show in detail what St. Paul simply asserts: "For this which is commanded: Thou shalt not commit adultery: Thou shalt not kill: Thou shalt not steal: Thou shalt not covet and if there be any other commandment (negative or positive), it is summed up in this word: Thou shalt love thy neighbours as thyself."

St. Paul's order does not happen to be the most logical in view of explaining the series of evils that charity excludes. The common order of the commandments serves this purpose better. The divine charity, which is the love of neighbour, does not injure the person of the neighbour in life or limb; it does not injure him in the conjoined person who is his wife; it does not injure him in his goods; and it does not covet either his wife or goods. Whatever commandment we may think of in regard to our neighbour is comprised and summed up in this word: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The Vulgate has translated the Greek verb *anakephalaionta* with *instauratur*, which is less exact than *recapitulatur*. The meaning is: "summed up, resumed, comprehended, comprised." If we want to put all laws into one word, that word is "charity."

Father Lagrange observes that the next verse: "Charity does not do evil to the neighbour" (the Vulgate reading the genitive *proximi* instead of the dative *proximo* is translated: The love of the neighbour works not evil)—Father Lagrange, I say, notes that the verse contains a sort of attic salt, a little bit of refined wit—we should rather call it *litotes*, saying less in order to say more. "Certainly it is not a sufficient eulogy of charity to say that it does no wrong to the neighbour. St. Paul said much more than that about charity in his famous encomium of that virtue in 1 Cor. XIII, but here he contents himself with saying that charity is not a doer of evil. But that is saying a good deal."

The last sentence is generally translated: "Charity is the fulfilling of the law." We have preferred to give *plerōma* its usual meaning: "Charity is the fulness of the law," that is, it embraces the whole law in its plenitude or fulness. Father Lagrange's judicious comment is to the point:

"Is *Plerōma* impletio or plenitudo? To say merely that charity is

the fulfilling of the law would be to regard it strictly as commanded, and such it is in effect according to Lev. 19: 18, which the Apostle has cited. But according to his statement that the debt of charity always remains, Paul would say that charity is never so fulfilled as not to leave room for further fulfilment. His idea, then, is that charity, were it perfect, would be not only the accomplishment of a precept but something which comprises the plenitude of all the precepts and of all works." The learned Dominican quotes a Greek writer Euthymius as saying pithily: "Charity is the fulness, as having the doing of all good things, and the avoidance of all bad things, for which double purpose all the precepts of the law have been given."

Charity, say St. Chrysostom (in h.l.), is not merely the accomplishing of some part of the commandments, but the whole sum of virtue in us.

W. LEONARD.

Notes

Since the *Australasian Catholic Record* was revived in 1924, the annual subscription has not risen above the initial charge of fifteen shillings. The great changes in paper and printing costs have unhappily at long last forced the *A.C.R.* ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION to raise the annual subscription by five shillings. We feel sure that our readers will appreciate the necessity of this move.

Australasian Catholic Record.

This little tribute to a great Catholic savant and an illustrious son of St. Ignatius Loyola cannot be quite impersonal. For more than thirty years the writer has had a veritable devotion to the learned and saintly

Professor of the Institut Catholique of Paris, who went to his eternal reward on IN MEMORIAM— JULES LEBRETON, S.J. July 5, 1956, at the age of 83. I remember standing one January morning of 1952 in the courtyard of the Institut Catholique. It was about 11 a.m., and, between lectures, students were coming and going with French briskness. One thing I remember well: The only person that my thoughts turned to that morning was Father Jules Lebreton. He was no longer at the Institut, having finished his teaching there on reaching his seventieth birthday, in 1943. He had been doyen of the Theological Faculty, and even after he left he remained doyen honoraire. He well deserved such an an honour, for he had given nearly 40 years of service to the University (1905-1943).

The present tribute to a beloved writer, whom I did not know personally, must, I fear, take the form of a semi-biographical meditation. The facts of his life I do not know sufficiently well to outline them with easy accuracy. A meditation, however, need only contain biographical points—like a second Nocturn of the Breviary. Happily, composition of place can be partially satisfactory, for I visited Tours, the city of Jules Lebreton's birth, the Catholic Institute where he taught so fruitfully, and the house in Rue Monsieur at Paris, where so many of his contributions to the review *Etudes* and the *Recherches de Science Religieuse* were handled and given to the public.

So far, then, for the first and second prelude. The body of the meditation will be a review of Father Lebreton's immense literary output since he first began to publish in 1897.

Fortunately, I have first-hand acquaintance with most of his better-known works: those published in book form. There is, first of all, the great, masterly treatise on the Dogma of the Trinity. Next in importance to this two-volume work, which appeared in 1910 and 1927-1928, is the two-volume *Life of Christ (La Vie et l'Enseignement de Jésus-Christ, Notre Seigneur)*, which reached a nineteenth edition in 1951.

To these must be added his latest labour of love, which occupies columns 966 to 1073 of the *Supplément du Dictionnaire de la Bible*. This is the article, "Jésus Christ," published in 1947-1948. It is indeed a fitting swan-song from a favourite pupil of the great Léonce de Grandmaison, whose superb apologetic work, "Jésus Christ, sa personne, son message, ses preuves," Father Lebreton edited, with an introduction, after Father Grandmaison's death in 1927.

We must not forget Jules Lebreton's very competent contribution to the first two volumes of Fliche and Martin's "Histoire de l'Eglise." In collaboration with J. Zeiller, a Sorbonne scholar and Membre de l'Institut, he gave what is perhaps exceptional value to those volumes on the history of the Primitive Church and on its history from the second century to the Constantinian edict of toleration. Of the thirty-five chapters that make up those two volumes, nineteen—and those the most succulent—are from the pen of Lebreton.

Three smaller books deserve mention. They are: *Le Dieu vivant, La Révélation de la sainte Trinité dans le Nouveau Testament—La Vie Chrétienne, au premier siècle de l'Eglise—Lumen Christi, La doctrine Spirituelle du Nouveau Testament*. The first is a beautiful little book of 177 pages, inspired by what is called the Johannine meteor of Matthew and Luke (Mt. 11:25-27); the second, which is a volume of Maurice Brilliant's collection, "Le vie chrétienne," draws waters of doctrine and piety in refreshing abundance from the Synoptic Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the Johannine writings; the third is a volume of the *Verbum Salutis* series, published in 1947. Into it Father Lebreton poured much of his glowing Christo-centric devotion—ascetic and mystical.

Two other small books I do not happen to know. They are Lebreton's biographical sketch of his revered master, Léonce de Grandmaison (1932) and some studies in Mystic Theology, entitled: "*Tu Solus Sanctus. Jésus-Christ vivant dans les saints* (1948).

Besides some very notable contributions to the *Dictionnaire Apologetique* (D.A.F.C.) and the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (D.S.), the above would be regarded as the major part of Father Lebreton's literary work.

Actually they are not. Qualitatively these volumes would indeed contain much of his best work, but quantitatively they are only a fraction of his entire output. A full bibliography from 1897 to 1950 appeared in the second volume of *Mélanges Jules Lebreton (Recherches de Science Religieuse)*, April-October, 1951, to January-April, 1952 (Vols. 39, Nos. 2-4 and 40, Nos. 1-2). This miscellany, offered to the veteran scholar from the pens of over sixty admirers on the completion of his sixtieth year under the banner of St. Ignatius, presents a bibliography which is an astounding revelation of the literary apostolate of the diamond jubilarian. He contributed articles, bulletins, literary chronicles, and reviews to some twenty periodicals, chiefly the Jesuit *Etudes*, the *Revue d'Apologétique*, and the *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, which last he himself, together with Léonce de Grandmaison, founded in 1910. We can best take note of some items of this intense activity within the frame of a biographical outline.

Jules Lebreton, one of whose ancestors in the distant past would have come from Brittany (for such remote provenance is indicated by names like Lebreton, Langlois, Lallemand), was born at Tours on March 20, 1873. He seems to have had a very pious mother, to whose memory he later dedicated a brochure entitled, "Marie Lebreton. Notes et Souvenirs." The city of Tours, then a city of 60,000 souls, was also a pious mother full of holy and illustrious memories: St. Gratian, its first Bishop and the splendid cathedral that bears his name; St. Martin and St. Gregory of Tours; Alcuin's Abbey School at the end of the eighth century, and latest, but not least, the famous "holy man" of Tours, Léon Dupont, who was still alive when Jules Lebreton was born. He died in 1876.

It seems fitting that a future historian (not indeed of the Franks, but of Christian origins) should have studied in the College of St. Gregory of Tours. No doubt, the school kept up the good linguistic reputation of Touraine. This part of France, like Tuscany in regard to Italian, is said to have the best French in the country.

On October 9, 1890, Jules Lebreton entered the exiled French novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Canterbury, England. After his vows in 1892 he did two years of literary studies at Canterbury, taught rhetoric for a year at Le Mans, and then returned to Canterbury to teach Latin and Greek in the Juvenate. While occupied in this work of teaching (1895-1899) he prepared doctoral theses on Cicero and Caesar, which he was to defend brilliantly in 1901.

It was at Canterbury that he first exercised his pen, beginning with

five pages on the Cathedral of Canterbury for the Messenger of the Sacred Heart at Toulouse. Then came a morphological and semantic study on the Latin verbal adjective in *-ndus*, for the Linguistic Society of Paris, and, above all, the philological works: "Etudes sur la langue et la Grammaire de Cicéron" and "Caesariana Syntaxis quatenus a Ciceroniana differat"—both published by Hachette in 1901.

In the meantime he had done his philosophy at Jersey and entered the Jesuit Theologate at Fourvière, Lyons. Anti-clerical persecution again drove him to England, and it was at Canterbury he finished his theology in 1904. He did his tertianship at Mold, in North Wales. The young Jesuit was thus able to acquire a thorough mastery of English.

Classical studies, especially Cicero and Plato, might have claimed him, but in 1905 and 1907 his career was set on the lines of Theology, and particularly the study of Christian origins. It happened this way:

In October, 1905, Monsignor Péchenard, Rector of the Institut Catholique, called him to one of the chairs of Dogmatic Theology. The lectures he gave on the Holy Trinity and on the Blessed Eucharist during the next two years circulated in roneo-typed copies, and he was already contributing to *Etudes* and the *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*.

The Modernist crisis was at its peak when, in 1907, the new Rector, Alired Baudrillart (later Cardinal) entrusted Father Lebreton with the chair of the History of Christian Origins in the same Theological Faculty. He was thus launched on his life's work. He occupied this chair for almost seven lustres (1907-1943), with a single long interruption of five years. A very serious illness kept him almost inactive from 1912 to 1917.

At the time that the Encyclical *Pascendi* appeared we find him writing a reply to the attack of George Tyrrell. With regard to Father Lebreton's polemics we should make the remark here that he was never in the least violent. He had not even that brilliance of style or that gallic salt which not seldom damages truth and charity with its very cleverness. He was always admirably clear and may be taken as a shining example of a writer whose aim was to state the case accurately, always relying more on the innate force of truth than on the graces of a human pen.

The foundation of the quarterly, *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, by himself and Grandmaison, offered Lebreton a new vehicle for his literary apostolate. For thirty years he consigned to its pages bulletins of the History of Christian Origins, which were amongst the most appreciated pages of French Catholic periodical literature. Readers found

here during the years from 1910 to 1945 a supreme expert's presentation of all the important works that appeared from time to time on the history of the primitive church. Of those bulletins in particular the directors of *Recherches* say: "We do not find in them the caustic and formidable verve of a Duchesne, but after all, something better. Here one finds a sympathetic effort to enter thoroughly into the thoughts of an author, an effort to present them with serenity and subject them to a penetrating criticism. The judgment of the critic could mostly be relied upon as decisive. From Lebreton's criticism there emerged, when need called for it, personal and luminous views, such as a master could advance who had examined the texts himself with all the resources of trained philological erudition joined to a profound knowledge of the life of the Church and its doctrinal struggles." (R.S.R. July-September, 1956.)

At the head of the *Mélanges Jules Lebreton* in 1952, Bishop Blanchet, present Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris, wrote in a similar tone:

"With the moderation that goes with strength, with the liberty of spirit which absolute disinterestedness gives, with the nobility of one whose only concern is the service of the Church through means worthy of her dignity, without human respect, he made his grand contribution to positive ecclesiastical science. In his work, scientific honesty was so exacting and exact, altitude of views so serene, religious sense so true, docility to the Church marked with such a seal of grandeur, that Father Lebreton's work won its way not only by its sterling value but by the spirit which animated it. In this regard, the fruit of his pen is an exemplary achievement."

In spite of a rigorous scientific method, which did not admit fervorinos, Father Lebreton's deep spirituality appears constantly throughout his pages. I have also met priests who knew "the spiritual man" as a retreat-giver, and they were strong in attesting that "the fire which Christ came to cast on the earth" was well kindled in the heart of Jules Lebreton.

The following inscription appeared on the front page of the *Mélanges* of 1952: "Reverendo Patri Julio Lebreton—sexagesimum sub Christi vexillo annum iam explenti—de M. Tullio primum—dein de primordiis Ecclesiae—et de SS. Trinitatis Mysterio praeclare merito—fratres, amici, discipuli, debitores—hanc grati animi significationem dedere."

Those who have been disciples through his works only will also join in this tribute. In memoria aeterna erit justus.

W. LEONARD.

*

*

*

*

Delegations to Red China and Catholic participation in them pose a problem of conscience both for those who may be eligible to join them, and for those to whom these latter may look for advice. The problem is scarcely foreseen by the standard moral DELEGATIONS TO works but some attempt must be made to COMMUNIST CHINA estimate the factors involved. The following notes are, therefore, offered formally as an opinion—"formally," since while the conclusion reached is believed to be sufficiently probably, there is some possibility that the contrary position may be true. It is hoped that in discussion the morality of the question may be made more precise.

While the case considered is that of a projected official delegation of Australian University students at the invitation of the Red Government and at its expense, it is presented here as applicable to any delegation of a "cultural" type. Delegations of students, school teachers, youth associations, art groups—all would be examples of the type. Delegations at a diplomatic or service level would obviously need separate consideration since these would be at less risk and with real hope of effect.

It seems that the projected official delegation of University students to China, at the invitation and expense of the de facto government of that country raises a genuine moral problem. It would seem to come under the general category of co-operation in an action, neutral in itself, but involving in its circumstances, the serious possibility of harmful moral effects without reasonable hope of even proportionate good.

A. Good could conceivably follow such a delegation in the following circumstances:

(i) *If there were reasonable hope of helping towards the conversion or even of making a Christian impression on the people met.*

This is offset by—

- (a) the official nature of the invitation, no normal means of free communication being open;
- (b) the youth of the delegates, differences in their religious outlook, if any, the shortness of the visit, lack of language and the consequent necessity of official interpreters.
- (c) the fact that there are already many Chinese Christians much

more competent to effect such a change if it were possible at present;

- (d) the lack of any extrinsic evidence of 'bona fides' on the part of the Red government—and the weight of evidence against it in the continued persecution of the Church and positive exclusion of official Christian influence;
- (e) the nature of the delegation makes no positive provision for free exchange of views at this level—in which case to do so would be an embarrassment and in a sense out of order.

(ii) *If there were reasonable hope of relieving the oppression of the peoples concerned.*

This is obviously negligible. The tour will necessarily be a controlled one, if for language reasons alone. The proposed delegation is not at the proper level to hope for such an effect even supposing 'bona fides' on the part of the Government.

(iii) *If some information were thus made available which could not be otherwise obtained, and which would be relevant to peaceful relations between Australia and China.*

It would seem that this is at least unlikely.

- (a) Others have spent many years in the country and their published impressions have very great authority where they themselves are reliable. This is true of Missionaries in particular whose interest has been recent and wide enough to cover both spiritual and material and technical conditions prevailing there.
- (b) Others who have not been there so long have been trained observers with wide range of contact and relative freedom of movement. Press observers for instance, whose observations have appeared in many countries, Ceylon, U.S., France, v.g.

It would seem to be at least presumptuous to suggest that a body of students going under the conditions of this delegation could learn more and more reliably.

- (c) It is a cultural, not scientific delegation and so scarcely competent as such, to gather even useful technical knowledge. Besides, there are other and proper methods of obtaining this, if it exists, without the same risks.

B. The possibility of moral harm is on the other hand very real.

- (i) *On the part of a Catholic in the delegation.*

It is necessary to insist that this is not precisely an exchange of persons in which case other norms might apply¹ but an official delegation. This has certain consequences:

¹cf. "Policy statement of the Ethics Committee of the Catholic Association for

- (a) a Catholic member of it cannot easily disassociate himself from the views expressed publicly or privately by the leader or any spokesman of it. He is in a sense committed and in danger of being seriously compromised. This is particularly true of one who must rely on an interpreter;
- (b) he runs a lesser but real risk of compromising the Church and of giving scandal to members of the Mystical Body at present suffering gravely in the oppression of the Faith in China;
- (c) he runs the risk of "abstracting from his Faith," i.e., of speaking as a student, not as a Catholic. This is illegitimate and dangerous since the Faith engages the whole person;
- (d) he gives the delegation a "universal" character and helps make it truly representative of all responsible elements in the Australian University.

(ii) *On the part of the delegation generally.*

- (a) The delegation, comprised at least in part of relatively inexperienced youth will meet highly experienced skilled and dedicated propagandists with consequent risk of moral influence.
- (b) It will presumably be shown the very great material and technical progress being made in China, but cannot be presumed to have the maturity and culture to estimate the spiritual devastation and oppression upon which it is built, even if it could be presumed that they would have the time and opportunity to acquaint themselves with it.

The sense evidence of impressive material progress could be transformed easily in such young people into a conviction that spiritual progress was commensurate. This distortion could again be an occasion of dangerous psychological and moral influence.

- (c) The guest status of the delegation, its financial obligation to the government, and the welcome which would be accorded puts its members at a grave moral disadvantage. The normal politeness and courtesy which these things would necessarily demand in return could easily be interpreted as an approval of the regime in general—even where it was intended by the delegation only in a reserved and qualified sense to cover particular courtesies.

All of these reasons would apply a fortiori to a Catholic member of such a delegation. He could well find himself compromised into acts seeming to approve of a regime responsible for the grossest criminal

acts, either by its direct commission or in its tacit approval. Such a risk could be taken with moral goodness only where there was some evidence of a change of heart. In the absence of such evidence, the risk should not be taken.

(iii) *On the part of the Communist Party.*

There is every reason to doubt the 'bona fides' of the Party, and every reason to presume that the delegation would be used for propaganda purposes. This could contribute directly to the Communist cause either in giving added conviction and confidence to Communists themselves, or by making the cause of its opponents seem hopeless or wrong, and thus inducing them to abandon their fight against it. (It is not precisely Christians who are in mind here, but, v.g., resisting Chinese and Chinese living outside China and being pressed by the Red regime).

It is true that refusal of the offer can also be used as propaganda—but this would seem a lesser evil than propaganda based on acceptance.

"Hence also it becomes clear that a pacifist effort or propaganda originating from those who deny all belief in God,—if indeed not undertaken as an artful expedient to obtain the tactical effect of creating excitement and confusion—is always very dubious and incapable of lessening or of eliminating the anguished sense of fear."²

"Man, face to face with opinions and systems opposed to the true religion, is of course, always bound by the limits established by God in the natural and supernatural order. In obedience to this principle, our peace programme cannot approved of an indiscriminate co-existence at all costs with everybody; certainly not at the cost of truth and justice. These irremovable boundary marks, in effect, demand complete observance."³

For these reasons it would seem that at present solid reasons could be given against the delegation generally and a warning made against Catholic participation even if in some cases it might not be observed.

C. *The Chaplain's Position.*

The spiritual director must here make a prudent judgment on sufficient probability. The facts and probabilities will change from time to time—one *real* indication of 'bona fides' for instance could change the whole situation. Those who are specifically acquainted with the facts and with overseas practical decisions on similar problems could well be consulted.

²Pope Pius XII, Christmas Message, 1954.

Catholic Documentation, December, 1955, p. 18.

³Id. Christmas Message, 1955.

Catholic Documentation, March, 1956, p. 13.

Once the judgment is made the students can act on it with certainty even if the grounds for it are necessarily only probable. This is especially true if the judgment is also that of the Ordinary. They cannot be expected to see the validity of such judgment, but once it is accepted in goodwill, there seems no reason why theoretical discussion should not continue, and every reason why the Director should confide his reasons to them.

P. M. FARRELL, O.P.

*

*

*

*

MANUAL FOR INTERIOR SOULS, by John Nicholas Grou, S.J.
(London: Burns & Oates. 1955. 272 pp. 24/3).

This volume seems to be the first in the new series of Orchard Books, devoted chiefly to the spiritual classics, though on the fly-leaf there is a list of other old favourites that have also been re-edited. Most libraries in well-established religious Houses probably contain the manual in a somewhat tattered condition, for ever since its first publication in England in 1874 it has been among the most widely read of the spiritual classics. In this new edition arranged and introduced by Fr. Donal O'Sullivan, S.J., a younger generation of priests and religious are privileged to learn from Grou's Manual the teaching that made him such a master in the spiritual life.

The manual consists of Conferences delivered by Fr. Grou while he was in hiding in Paris from 1770 until 1792. When the Society of Jesus was suppressed in France in 1763 he was a mature Jesuit, though only thirty-two years old. After being expelled from the country he came back to Paris in 1770, devoting himself for the next twelve years to prayer, writing, hearing confessions and giving conferences in religious houses—twelve years of suffering alleviated no doubt by the knowledge that the Archbishop of Paris was his secret protector. With the outbreak of the Revolution in 1792 Grou left for England, where he lived in Dorset with the Catholic family of Weld in whose home he died in 1803.

Readers, acquainted with Bremond and his ex-Jesuit mentality, have found no little amusement in his estimate of Grou, whom he describes as "admirable," "a Bérullian Jesuit," "this outstanding contemplative of the eighteenth century in France"—the implication being, of course, that to be a follower of Bérulle improved a Jesuit who thus became a little less Ignatian. Fr. O'Sullivan goes into all this in his well-balanced pages of Introduction to the new edition of Grou's manual where teaching transcends all arguments of "old school ties." One remark from the Introduction may be quoted: "Attempts to divorce Grou spiritually from the Society of Jesus are the more distasteful because of his own devotion to it in the sad period of its suppression, and his great historical importance as a living link between the 'old' Society and the 'new'."

M.O.

Book Reviews

MEDICAL ETHICS, by Edwin J. Healy, S.J., Loyola University Press, Chicago, 1956. pp. 440. \$6.00.

New discoveries of science can give rise to fresh problems affecting the application of the changeless moral law. This is certainly verified in the practice of the medical profession, where the old difficulties remain much as they were, and new ones are constantly arising. The conscientious physician can be faced with a decision which may mean life or death to his patient, and at the same time he must be careful not to transgress the norms of true morality. Unless one has solid principles on which to work, and also a clear and rational approach to an individual case, sentiment can easily take the place of reason and expediency become the chief guide as to what is right or wrong. The moralist may enlarge on the limits of man's dominion over his life and bodily members; he may give the circumstances in which the principle of the double effect is applicable; he may distinguish between formal and material co-operation, and show the fallacy of justifying the means by the end in view; but even an expert will often hesitate to give more than a probable opinion, when the principles are to be applied in a given case. This is especially true if the facts of the case are known only from the findings of a science with which the moralist is often only slightly acquainted. The doctor who is in need of a practical answer has not always ready access to the moralist; and when the priest is confronted with a medico-moral case, he cannot be so sure that he has understood the question and can trust his own judgment to give a safe direction. The book under review will be valuable both to the clergy and the members of the medical profession. It has the advantage of giving not merely a clear exposition of the principles involved, but also their application to numerous cases (one hundred and seventy-one of them), which are likely to occur.

In the introductory chapter, the basis of the moral law is explained: all things were made by God, Who will reward the good and punish the wicked; man has a rational and immortal soul, and being endowed with reason and free will, must direct himself according to the Will of God as manifest to Him. The moral law is universal in regard to time and holds even in the changing conditions of the modern world; it binds all men, irrespective of their religious outlook. Then the author lays down six principles covering the right of man to life and truth and justice, and his obligation to use his faculties for the purposes of nature, to refrain from evil and formal co-operation therein, however good be the end in view. Passing to the obligations of physicians in general, he deals briefly but adequately with the need of professional competency, which includes a knowledge of the moral law; the duty of attending his patients, arising from justice when in receipt of a fee and otherwise from charity; the use of safe remedies, and when it would be lawful to try as a last resort a doubtful remedy which held out some hope of

success; the use of drugs and the administration of opiates to the dying. Some practices, which are open to question or unethical, such as fee-splitting and ghost surgery, are also considered, and a good treatment is given of the ethics of mental reservation, and of the need and limits of the professional secret. Other matters discussed are the obligation to prolong life by ordinary means, and sometimes by those which are extraordinary; and the ethics of self-defence against an unjust aggressor—which the unborn child is not. When we add that there is a statement of the principles of the double effect and of co-operation in the sin of another, it will be seen how embracing is the scope of the work.

The chapter on surgery is well done, based on the morality of mutilation. In the section dealing with the transplantation of organs, the author rightly rules out any mutilation, with a view to transplantation in the body of another, which would interfere with the substantial integrity of the donor. By the loss of substantial integrity, he understands the complete suppression of the function, which would occur, in the case of double organs, only if both were sacrificed. Doubting whether this can be reconciled with recent papal teaching, he concludes that the opinion which would permit transplantations from a living person, even if it did not cost the donor his substantial integrity, is in disfavour. Perhaps, it would be better to define substantial mutilation as the suppression of the organ rather than of the function.

As we might expect, a good deal of space is devoted to the problems of married life, conception, pregnancy and delivery—all set out with practical examples. The influence of the physician on the moral life of his patient, especially as regards marriage and its intimacies, and the sex education of children (with wholesome hints for the cure of the habit of self-abuse), is given the prominence it deserves but seldom receives. The treatment of the Sacraments will prove useful, not merely to non-Catholic doctors who are anxious to help, but also to the well-instructed Catholic.

One feature of the work which appeals is that the theology is explained in a manner which can be understood by the physician, and the medical questions presented are not obscured by too liberal a use of technical terms. Some of these are, of course, unavoidable, but their meaning becomes clear from the reading of the text. The author has fulfilled his purpose of writing a textbook for use in Catholic medical schools and a reference book for use in Catholic hospitals, having in mind also "the many thousands of non-Catholic physicians to whom the book might be helpful, not as something to be studied from cover to cover, but as a reference to be used as occasion arises."

J.M.

* * * *

THE NECESSITY OF CONFESSION FOR THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE. By Rev. Paul E. McKeever, S.T.L. The Catholic University of America Press. Washington, D.C. 1953. 2 Dollars.

This doctoral dissertation was submitted to the Faculty of the School of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University of America, and

is now presented to us in the series of "Studies in Sacred Theology" published by the same University.

The whole treatise concerns the question of the nature of the necessity to confess one's sins in order to receive the Sacrament of Penance, in other words, whether confession is necessary by a necessity of means, or merely by one of precept. The discussion of this question is centred around the arguments of the chief defender of the latter theory, Father Anthony Ballerini, S.J., formerly professor at the Gregorian University in Rome. The thesis in review is in opposition to the opinion defended by Father Ballerini. It is, therefore, of an argumentative and controversial nature, and the author is highly successful in discussing, and discussing critically, the arguments mustered by his illustrious opponent.

The dissertation is well set out, with a clear and detailed table of contents, a copious bibliography and an extensive alphabetical index. Furthermore, the text is well documented, each citation having its corresponding reference.

The treatise is divided into four chapters. First the author very clearly defines the terms 'necessity of means', whether 'in re' or 'in voto', and 'necessity of precept'. He then goes on to outline Tridentine teaching concerning the judicial aspect of the Sacrament of Penance and the theology of the keys in S. Thomas, Peter Lombard, and Duns Scotus. In chapter II the author expounds at length post-Tridentine thought on the necessity of confession, in both the Thomist and Scotist Schools. He then begins his detailed and logical analysis of the theory of Father Ballerini. Chapter III concerns generic confession; the author shows the inconsistencies of the arguments of Father Ballerini, especially in the light of the Council of Trent. Finally in chapter IV the author turns to the absolution of those destitute of their senses; again he demonstrates the weakness of Father Ballerini's case, for from the practice of the Church in granting such absolution Father Ballerini draws his strongest argument. The author furthermore cites at length the teaching of moralists, especially of S. Alphonsus, and Pontifical Documents referring to such absolution.

We may summarily state the author's arguments, based on Father Ballerini's own writings, as follows:

(1) Unless the more common teaching of the necessity of means be admitted, either contrition and confession are not of the nature of the Sacrament, which destroys the necessity of sorrow as well as of self accusation, or their institution actually took place separately from that of the Sacrament itself, as related in the gospel of S. John (ch. 20, vv. 22-23), and such a separate institution has to be proved, and is not proved by Father Ballerini.

(2) Generic confession requires some sign from the penitent, whether certain or uncertain, for the judicial nature of the Sacrament must be respected, although the Sacrament can and should be administered according to human needs and possibilities.

(3) The practice of the Church is to absolve those destitute of their senses and in danger of death, but Father Ballerini has not proved,

and cannot, that such a practice includes the absolving of those who have definitely given no sign of the will to confess; on the contrary, in such circumstances a will to confess must be presumed.

The thesis has its practical aspect. Father Ballerini has attempted to give a speculatively satisfying explanation of the absolution of the unconscious, but the author illustrates in great detail and with vigorous logic the latent contradictions, the inadequacy of argument and the disregard of the common testimony of theologians in Father Ballerini's theory. Unfortunately, however, at the end of the dissertation the author fails to give a clear and full conclusion, summing up all his arguments concerning both Father Ballerini's opinion and that of the author himself.

For those interested in the speculative and argumentative this work should prove enjoyable, provocative, and instructive.

B.I.H.

* * * *

THE PRIEST IN THE WORLD, by Josef Sellmair. Burns Oates, London, 1954.

Books on the Priesthood have always had a definite place in Catholic literature, but in our own day it would seem that they are becoming more common and more varied. Changing conditions in the world, changes in thought and attitude and even the advance of materialism have not obliterated the priest, rather have they served in a sense to emphasize him. Even the modern novelist, for good or evil, seems to have discovered him and priestly characters, life-like or in caricature, have become part of the modern story. In such an atmosphere more and more spiritual writers are devoting their attention to the Priesthood, trying as they go to define the place and the attitude of the priest in and towards the changing world about him. Some of these follow ascetical lines, emphasizing the spiritual life of the priest and the means to augment it. Others, while admitting, as they must, that the foundation of all priestly endeavour is personal holiness, go on to suggest techniques and plans whereby the priest may cope with and at least partly conquer the world in which he lives. The result is an ever increasing flow of what might be termed "sacerdotal" literature.

This book is a translation by Brian Battershaw of the latest edition of Father Josef Sellmair's "*Der Priester in der Welt*." When it was first published just before the last war it attracted considerable notice in Germany and ran through five editions. Allowing that with books as with men sudden notoriety is not necessarily the badge of excellence, there is ample evidence that in this case the acclaim was justified.

The idea of the book, the author tells us, is to set forth the right relationship between humanity and mystery in the secular priest and to give him back the full rights of his humanity when it was tending to be thrust into the background and atrophied. In brief, only he who is good, complete and genuine as a man, can be a good, complete and genuine priest. He believes that though the Thomist principle, "*Gratia non destruit sed supponit et perficit naturam*," has not been forgotten.

it may well have been quoted too often. Some people he feels did not dare to take it seriously. And "yet precisely, as the supernatural does not suspend the laws of nature, so also it does not dispense men from the demands of natural ethics or from the practice of natural virtues." Justice, prudence, courage and moderation should be the foundation stones on which a system of manly ethics is erected. Its crown will be that Christian bearing which the supernatural virtues bring into being—that and the gift of the Holy Ghost and ultimately its fruits. Man, so long as he desires to be no more than man will necessarily be something less, but on the other hand, in the author's view, the ascetic who merely despises created nature despises the Creator Himself.

He maintains that the nature of the priestly existence is to be on the boundary, at the margin where human and superhuman touch, when the divine is married to "the servile form of the earthy." This position leads to that strangeness of the priest in the world whereby he is often misunderstood, feared or hated. And it leads also to a tension within himself lest he deviate to the right or the left by shrinking from or despising the world on the one hand or by succumbing to it on the other. The truly manly priest has a dynamic place in the world, but he can never be of the world.

Writing with that close intensity, or should we say depth, that characterises so many European writers he gives practical application of his thesis over two hundred pages and more and under such headings as "The Position of the Secular Priest," "The Priest and Learning," "Human Culture and Christian Culture," "Personality and Ascetism," "The Priest and Women," and so on. Whatever the reader's conclusions at the finish, he will certainly not feel that he has wasted his time.

J.F.

*

*

*

*

FIRST AUSTRALIAN CONGRESS OF RELIGIOUS BROTHERS. Published by direction of the Provincials' Committee of Religious Brothers of Australia, New Zealand and Oceania. 1956. pp. 144.

At the request of the S. Congregation of Religious, conveyed by His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate (Most Rev. Romolo Carboni, S.T.D., J.C.D.), the First Australian Congress of Religious Brothers was held at Mount St. Mary's, Strathfield, from Tuesday, 30th August, to Thursday, 1st September, 1955. Some one hundred and twenty Brothers took part, representing the four teaching Congregations well known in Australia: the Marist, Patrician, Christian and de la Salle Brothers. The Brothers of St. John of God, whose care is mainly devoted to the sick and infirm, also joined in the Congress and were responsible for the first paper on the "Education of Retarded Children." The acknowledged competency of the delegates and the nature of subjects listed for discussion justified the hope that the results would be beneficial not only to the religious in whose interest the work was primarily undertaken, but to the Church in Australia. No doubt, steps have been already taken in the different Congregations of the Brothers to imple-

ment the suggestions brought forward and discussed at the Congress. Now that the papers have been published, all who wish may avail of this excellent contribution to the advancement of the religious life and the apostolic labours of the Brothers.

The opening address of His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, set forth the purpose of the Congress: to study the religious life under the threefold aspect of the spiritual life of the members, their religious and professional formation and their apostolic work. With several thought-provoking questions, and a survey of the nature and purpose of the religious life, His Excellency paved the way for the detailed treatment which was to follow. After the paper, referred to already, on the Education of Retarded Children, thorough and practical in its exposition of a subject that is yet little known and has received scant attention from Catholic Educationalists in Australia, the Congress proceeded to deal with the training of Religious Brothers in three papers: Vocational Recruiting, by Brother Joseph (Patrician); Formation of Young Religious, by Brother Ronald (Marist), and Deepening of the Religious Spirit, by Brother Aloysius (de la Salle). It is interesting to know that experience shows vocations are sown in the early years of the boys' life, when they are yet in the lower classes, and not by the words of the Brother Postulator, who comes into contact with them only when they are about to leave school and have already made up their minds on the state of life they intend to embrace. The dignity of the Brothers' life should be stressed when seeking for postulants, and the difference clearly pointed out between vocation to the Priesthood, whether secular or religious, and the vocation to the religious life in a lay institute. It is possible for a boy to be misdirected because of want of understanding on this matter. The contributor of the paper makes a good point when he remarks that too rosy a picture of the religious life is not really an attraction to boys, who like what calls for courage and manliness... and "tough going." The insistence should be on quality rather than quantity, for "the whole strength and power of a religious order lies in the quality not in the quantity of its members." In the discussion which followed Brother Joseph's paper, opinions were voiced about the most desirable age for a boy to enter the juniorate. One objection to admitting younger boys was that they would lack home training. This could be remedied by the practice of sending juniors home for the holidays. In practice, it seems that no hard and fast rule can be laid down, but there is certainly no evidence of a positive nature that early entry into the juniorate implies a subsequent lack of balance in the religious: at any rate, religious vocation is not for home life, much less for social life in the world. In the paper on "Formation of Young Religious," emphasis was placed on the time required for complete training, both religious and professional. The value of a longer scholasticate was expressed, wherein the young religious could attend to his professional preparation and, what is of more importance, the development of his religious life. Professional studies should not omit a systematic study of Religion. Brother Aloysius, F.S.C., spoke of the "Deepening of the

Religious Spirit." The problem of perseverance, he states, is even more crucial than the problem of recruitment; and perseverance means progress in the ways of sanctity, living the religious life to the full extent of one's capabilities. The first aim of any religious Institute is the personal sanctification of its members, and this must have precedence over all others. It is possible to pass through the novitiate with merely a negative and passive attitude which reacts against the religious in middle age. Whatever be the causes of failure: spiritual immaturity, spiritual laziness, overactivity, etc., opportunities are needed for refreshment of spirit, good Directors and careful screening of candidates. A second novitiate, or at least an opportunity for a long retreat in the maturity of manhood, to consider quietly his relations with God in the framework of his vocation is of the utmost importance for a religious.

"Higher Religious Studies for Brothers" is the title of a paper contributed by Brother J. S. Campbell, of the Christian Brothers. To overcome the unsatisfactory conditions at present prevailing, various suggestions are offered to give the Brothers a systematic knowledge of theological subjects: Dogma, Moral, Scripture and Church History. An intensive course during the Scholasticate, or a series of lectures during the school year at weekly or fortnightly intervals, or summer schools are all possibilities. Finally, in the paper prepared by a panel of Christian Brothers entitled "Preparation for Catholic Social Living," we have an ideal presentation of the aim of Catholic Education: that the boys would realise their membership of the Mystical Body of Christ and the development of their personality as children of men and sons of God.

The Congress was concluded by an encouraging address by His Eminence Cardinal Gilroy.

The impression left by the book is one of gratitude for the presence amongst us of such noble religious, who are determined to discover what weakness may be in their lives and work, to seek and apply the fitting remedies for their own greater progress in perfection and the consequent advantage of those among whom they exercise the apostolate.

J.M.

* * * *

THE HOLY BIBLE. Vol. 3. The Sapiential Books—Job to Sirach. Translation by Members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America. St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey. American Price, 5 dollars.

This beautiful book is a joy to handle and a joy to read. It is altogether worthy of the splendid reputation which the Catholic Biblical Association of America has built up for itself in just two decades of years. The illustrious originating and ever actively energetic personality that stood behind the Association's fine achievements in twenty years was the person of the late Archbishop Edwin O'Hara, Bishop of Kansas City. This volume, the third of the American Catholic version of the Old Testament, was issued, just in time to adorn the crown of joy of the Archbishop's golden jubilee of priesthood and silver jubilee of episcopate. It was as chairman of the Episcopal Committee of the Confratern-

ity of Christian Doctrine that Archbishop O'Hara began his fruitful patronage of this biblical work in 1944, eight years after the birth of the Catholic Biblical Association, and in the name of the same Episcopal Committee he graciously sent a congratulatory letter to the workers. It appears at the head of the volume.

The economy of the parts, the format, and the typographical layout of the book are admirable. The contributors wisely made the introductory preface to each book short, but their brevity is substantial brevity. In each case, they give what the intelligent reader requires by way of introduction to the text. As all seven books, with the exception of three chapters of Job (1, 2, 42) and large portions of Ecclesiastes are poetical compositions, they are printed as verse, in beautifully clear print and with such major and minor headings as are most helpful for intelligent reading, close study, and orderly meditation.

The whole apparatus of variant readings or emendations adopted by the translators is relegated to a section entitled "Textual Notes," filling 40 pages at the end of the volume. The footnotes are of two kinds: references to parallel passages, and exegetical notes. These are kept in separate compartments, so that the student is saved from even a minimum of confusion. A sparing economy has been adopted in regard to exegetical notes, much more sparing, for instance, than that found in the Italian translation published by the Biblical Institute. Those notes are pithy, however, and mostly supply help where help is needed. Practically on every page one is moved to congratulate the scholars and the technicians who have given us this precious volume.

From the points of view of verbal rendering, order of words, and rhythm, we should have many criticisms to offer, but such a list of petty things would risk being unfair to the general and very evident excellence of the translations of those seven books. Scholars sometimes nod. Few hebraists will agree that in Psalm 18:11 the word *dēbash* should be translated "syrup" (like the arabic *dibs*) rather than "honey." Even if the Hebrew word can sometimes mean "syrup" (and it is doubtful), the context would exclude it here. We feel sure, also, that, in the Psalms especially, more poetic strength could have been secured by closer adherence to the Hebrew order of words. Rhythm also is a controversial matter, and a tribute should be paid to the attention given to it by the translators. There are, however, many verses, which, we think, could be very much bettered. As an example, let us give the distich: "Why do the nations rage: and the peoples utter folly?" Compare this with the translation of the Psalterium Pianum: "Quare tumultuantur gentes: et populi meditantur inania?"

We should also like to see Job less pulled about textually—of course, it is a difficult matter, but manipulations of the textual order are not always necessary nor happy. We should also like to see more of the Old Latin additions given in the footnotes to Ecclesiasticus, especially for liturgical texts like chapter 24.

But these remarks must not diminish in any way the general verdict on this volume: Excellent.

W.L.

IRISH PILGRIMAGE, by D. Pochin Mould. Dublin, Gill and Son. 150 pp. 16/- in Ireland.

In an earlier book, *The Rock of Truth*, which, we are pleased to note, still continues to be a best-seller, the reader will remember how Dr. Pochin Mould described for us the fascinating stages of what might well be termed her Odyssey from Anglicanism through Agnosticism to Catholicism. Among the helps which she then acknowledged as profoundly influencing the course of her wanderings were the occasional visits she had made to contemporary Catholic communities in Scotland and her study of Scottish Catholic remains.

Not surprisingly, therefore, her latest book takes up again, but in much greater detail, the subject of Catholic origins, this time with special reference to Ireland, where for some years now she has been busily and fruitfully engaged in an endeavour to trace "something of the history of the Irish pilgrimages, the way that they have come about and the way in which they take place to-day."

Contrary to what we might expect it to be, *Irish Pilgrimage* is not a mere academic study of beliefs and customs long dead, but a gripping account of what is still a vital part of every-day Irish life. Not only does it present a cross-section of religious belief in Ireland from the earliest pagan times down to the present day; it paints as well a true picture of modern Irish society in all its aspects.

Likening all pilgrims to the Wise Men of old, Dr. Mould beautifully concludes her study: "The Irish pilgrimage follows in the same track." It is a strange path, for it has taken all the history of Ireland to lay the stones of its road; the briars of superstition grow along it and trip the unwary. Yet, and this is the essential point, the pilgrims are seeking neither for superstitions nor for archaeology; they are trying to follow the star which rises 'higher than a bell-tower' above the Child in His mother's arms; the Child who, as the old Irish phrases have it is 'the life of the family of heaven' and the breastplate of protection of eternal life without end'."

R.W.

*

*

*

*

ORIGEN, by J. Daniélou. Trans. by W. Mitchell, London, 1955. pp. XVII + 343. Sheed and Ward. 21/-.

Controversy is the lot of great men. The placid lives of the vast majority show up the greatness and smallness, truth and error, kindness and meanness of those who have the terrifying gift of genius. No man in the early Church is better known than Origen, for Eusebius was his warm admirer, and the dry historian in the VIth Book of the *Ecclesiastical History* cannot give enough details of the life and labours of Origen (Constantine and Origen were the foundations of Eusebius's world); yet Origen was the object of vehement criticism in his lifetime and long after; the tomb of this very holy man, who longed to shed his blood for Christ (it was a family honour, as Origen's noble father suffered for the faith under Septimius Severus) was, as Mgr. Duchesne wrote, long visited, at Tyre where the scholar died, but the delicate

stylist adds immediately: "I have not said it was venerated," for he was not a bishop nor a martyr (although he had been imprisoned for the faith), he was but a scholar, and as Duchesne rather maliciously points out, no legend gathered around his name, as scientific activity does not attract the *populaire*. Father Daniélou regards Origen as one who marks "a decisive period in all fields of Christian thought." Origen's bold attempt to present Christian teaching in the light of Greek philosophy deeply influenced the Alexandrian writers, Didymus the Blind and his followers; through the enthusiasm of St. Gregory the Wonder Worker, who had been Origen's pupil at Caesarea in Palestine, St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nazianzos and St. Gregory of Nyssa, the three Cappadocian Fathers, were all indebted to Origen in a very great way, while in the West Rufinus of Aquileia, Hilary of Poitiers, and Ambrose of Milan "owed much to his exegesis." On the other hand, many distinguished men fought the influence of Origen's thought as something evil. Indeed, St. Epiphanius devoted his talents and energy to tracking down the many heresies that sprang, in his opinion, from Origen's teaching.

Father Daniélou is a brilliant writer and he has written a book on Origen that deserves to be read and thought over. First of all he gives us a masterly survey of Origen's life. The beautiful beginnings in the Christian home of Leonidas, who as Eusebius tells us, used to kiss the breast of his sleeping infant son in honour of the Holy Spirit dwelling there, this wonderful child who alarmed Leonidas with his precocious genius. With his father's martyrdom, Origen took up the work that Clement of Alexandria had begun, namely, could Christian doctrine be reconciled with reason and science? Origen, it is stated, wrote some 6000 books of all sorts and sizes. He must have been one of the greatest workers of all time. His scriptural work, beginning with the *Hexapla*, a monument that nowadays would be the work of a team of scientific workers over long years, is discussed by the author, particularly as regards Origen's use of allegory. Father Daniélou deals admirably with Origen's work against Celsus, a work which displays another facet of the Alexandrian's insatiable curiosity. Even all this work did not satisfy Origen, who in *De Principiis* wrote "the first *Summa Theologica* produced long before John Damascene and Thomas Aquinas wrote theirs." In it the pioneer attempted to give a coherent interpretation of Christianity as a whole. Father Daniélou weighs its merits, while in a most interesting way discussing Origen's errors, subordinationism, pre-existence of souls, apokatastasis. Finally Origen's theology of the spiritual life is treated by a master in that field.

This is a well documented study which brings to life the great Origen and the problems that he had to face. A learned man used to say that everyone should spend at least a few days in Alexandria to breath the air that had filled the lungs of Origen, because as Eusebius said with pious exaggeration: "In the case of Origen I think that even the facts from his very swaddling-clothes, so to speak, are worthy of mention." Father Daniélou has been fortunate in his translator, as the text is lucid and pleasant.

T.V.

OUR TIME IS NOW: A Study of Some Modern Congregations and Secular Institutions, by Dr. Mary O'Leary. (Burns Oates, 1955). 118 pp. 15/6).

Archbishop Roberts, formerly Archbishop of Bombay, has written an Introduction to this book, with its title from Christopher Fry's play, *A Sleep of Prisoners*:

Thank God our time is now when wrong
Comes up to face us everywhere . . .

The book is the first of its kind to come our way, and we would like to see it read by all thoughtful Catholics, for the author (evidently a member of a Secular Institute) has set down with clarity and sympathy a great deal of what we know about the life of the uncloistered Religious who are making their mark in the modern world. We have little acquaintance with them in Australia, but anyone who has been fortunate enough to come under the influence of the Ladies of the Grail in Melbourne or Sydney will have met at least one of the so-called Secular Institutes. Those two words form scarcely a happy title which makes no mention of the strong life of prayer and contemplation that is the basis of each of the Secular Institutes. (The "Brown Sisters" in Sydney and the "Caravan Sisters" in Tasmania are Australia's first contribution to this "new look" for nuns.)

Dr. O'Leary truly sums up these lives when she writes: "Members will need a peculiar responsiveness of soul which will enable them to adapt themselves swiftly, peacefully and happily to the double rhythm of their life. One moment they are in prayer and silence, walking in spirit the paths of the Church's liturgy; the next they must respond to the bell announcing a caller, or they must carry their liturgical book out into the train, or bus, or car and offer God the praise of the Divine Office in places from which such prayer rarely ascends." Of course it is a special vocation, but it is a very thoughtless Catholic who sees in it a pleasant way of living in the bonds of poverty, chastity and obedience.

One of the first of these Institutes in this century was founded in Spain in 1911; perhaps it was the martyrdom of its founder (during the Civil War in 1936?) that gave the Congregation its final shape and the key to a flourishing apostolate. It is known as the Institute of St. Teresa, and its members are familiarly known as Teresianas. Every year fifty of them, after spending six years in the Institute, disperse for their several destinations to work among seculars. They are well-dressed young women, feminine and gracious, whom one could meet anywhere without suspecting the austere background of their lives. Each wears an unobtrusive gold bracelet from which hangs a small locket, the sign of her perpetual consecration. Their ideal is to be found in the words of their founder: "Your cell will be the most loving Heart of Jesus, and your habit, constant self-denial."

M.O

SAINTS AND THEIR ATTRIBUTES: WITH A GUIDE TO LOCALITIES AND PATRONAGE, by Helen Roeder, London, 1955. pp. XV + 391. Illus. Longmans. 18/9.

"This book," the author writes, "has not only been written for scholars.... It has been written for all sorts of people, from the artist who has been commissioned to paint a local saint, to the traveller, who, visiting a cathedral... has been astonished to come upon... a venerable bishop with a beehive." And what a useful book it is, crammed with that information which makes us all so envious of learned clerics who can tell us who is the patron saint of those falsely accused with non-chalance! For instance you want to know what are the emblems of St. Maurice, and is he patron of any calling? Well, then, consult the index of saints: *Maurice, M. Armour*. Under *Armour* in the main part of the book you find that St. Maurice (d. c. 287, Feast, 22 September) is represented as a Moorish warrior with lance and trefoil cross on his shield or banner. Five examples are given of the various settings in which the saint has been represented. He is venerated at St. Maurice-en-Valois, St. Moritz and Zofingen. Finally you learn that St. Maurice is patron of armies, armourers, infantry, hatters and knife-grinders, being invoked against demoniac possession, enemies of religion and gout.

Again, if you were confronted with the image of a female saint holding a lantern, which the devil tries to blow out (often with a pair of bellows), with this admirable book at hand, you look up *Lantern* and at once you identify the image as that of St. Gudula (d. 712), the patroness of Brussels. How often there is question of the symbols of the apostles and the national saints, which are difficult to find quickly without such a guide as this little book. The examples given above are a sample of the information that are contained in these pages, and besides that essential information which we may need in a moment, there is also a great deal of interesting and amusing knowledge of the piety, so very practical, of our ancestors in the Middle Ages.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

THE SUPERIOR'S HANDBOOK, by L. Colin, CSSR. (Mercier Press, Cork, 1955. 144 pp. 15/- stg.).

This is not an easy book to review—at least it is not easy to want to do it. The reviewer will ask himself: What attitude shall I adopt? Shall I show at once that I am allergic to Superiors? If so, I shall say that this is a most timely book telling Superiors how to do a better job. But am I allergic to Superiors? What about all those people in authority who have acted with much more kindness and restraint than I could ever have acted in times of difficulty? Still, one's own personal experience of happy co-operation with Superiors in one's own little plot is no proof that Superiors as a class are incapable of tyrannical government. In fact, there must be a great deal of it, or books like this would not be published. This one is written by a French Religious

priest in a spirit of charity for Superiors in all Orders. Even if a Superior does not feel that he commits any of the faults dealt with, he will be encouraged to know that certain lines of leniency to which he tends are all to the good.

There are some interesting remarks in the chapter entitled, *Obedience*: "There is a quite authentic kind of obedience to which all Superiors may attain and which St. Paul recommends when he says 'Submit to every creature'. Why should a Superior not act thus towards the secondary officers of his community, the bursar, prefect of the church, wardrobe keeper . . . ? Could he not gracefully conform, within the limits of their powers, as others do, to their arrangements and directions? More conscious of his servitude than concerned with his dignity, he should be pleased to render service to his subjects, and, following the example of the Master, who washed His disciples' feet, he should become their servant, and, when he goes into town, their messenger!"

Among the many felicitous observations made by the author is one on the necessity of kindness in a Superior: "When a Superior carries his religious in the depths of his heart he nearly always has them in the hollow of his hand." (The French text throughout was evidently lively, and the translation by Fergus Murphy is good.) There is a topical quality about some of the writing, as when the author reminds the Superior, "who holds the driving wheel, of the driver's code and also of some danger signals: Take care! Dangerous corner, one-way only, cross-roads, closed road, slow up, stop-signal, pull up!" A rueful examination of conscience for some impetuous Superiors! Later in the chapter the author says wisely: "Every Superior should distrust his first reactions and impressions. He should adopt the following resolution as an invariable rule of conduct: when swayed by any emotion or passion whatever, I will absolutely forbid myself any interior decision, any gesture, word or act of authority. Calm down first; afterwards we shall see."

Superiors of nunneries will read this book with profit, tinged with special interest, because Fr. Colin has refrained from looking (except occasionally) in their direction. How pleasant it must be for them to know that men also have to be taught how to speak the persuasive accents of Go! and Come!

M.O.